

[Faint handwritten scribble]

[Faint handwritten mark]

[Faint handwritten lines]

[Faint handwritten scribbles]

[Faint handwritten mark]

[Faint handwritten scribble]

[Faint handwritten mark]

SCS#1259

[Faint handwritten mark]

[Large dark smudge]

[Small handwritten mark]

[Small handwritten mark]

SCS #1259

A N
E N Q U I R Y
I N T O T H E
N e w O p i n i o n s

(Chiefly) Propagated by the
Presbyterians of Scotland;

Together also with some Animadversions
on a Late Book, Entituled, *A Defence*
of the Vindications of the Kirk :

In a L E T T E R to a Friend
at E D I N B U R G H.

By A. M. D. D.

Jeremiah 6.16.—*Ask for the Old Paths, where
is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall
find rest for your Souls : but they said, we will
not walk therein.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Bishop's*
Head in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1696.

AN

Y O L U R Y
THE
MAGAZINE

Containing
A Selection of
The most
Interesting
and
Useful
Articles
Published
in
the
Year
1800

By
A. L. B. & C.
LONDON

Printed
at
the
Office
of
the
Magazine
No. 10. St. Pauls Church-yard
LONDON

Price
Six
Pence
per
Volume
Bound
in
Half
Russet
Leather
Six
Pence
per
Volume
Bound
in
Paper
Six
Pence
per
Volume
Bound
in
Half
Russet
Leather
Six
Pence
per
Volume
Bound
in
Paper

THE
CONTENTS
OF THIS
TREATISE.

THE Introduction, inviting all the true Sons of the Church (especially the Afflicted Clergy) to the most serious Exercise of true Repentance and Humiliation, P. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, &c.

The Doctrines and Principles that we contend for against the later Sectaries are Primitive, Catholic, and Orthodox. p 9, 10, 11.

CHAP. I.

The Insufficiency of those Pleas and Arguments managed by the Presbyterians, against the Catholic Church, in Defence of their New Doctrine of Parity, p. 12, 13, 14.

The CONTENTS.

Their Arguments reduc'd to three general Heads, p. 15.

1. *Their Pleas from the Pretended immediate Institution of our Saviour, considered, p. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.*

2. *Their Arguments from the Confusion of Names, observable in the New Testament, proved to be Vain and Sophistical, p. 22, 23, 24, 25, &c.*

3. *Their Arguments from the Testimony of Ecclesiastical Writers examined, p. 39, 40.*

The Testimony of St. Clement the Apostolical Bishop of Rome, Vindicated from the Wilful Mistakes of Presbyterians, p. 41, 42, 43, 44, &c.

The Testimony of St. Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna and Disciple of St. John the Apostle, enquired into particularly, p. 49, 50, 51.

The Testimony from Hermas impartially viewed, and the Disingenuity of Monsieur Blondel reprov'd, p. 52, 53, 54, &c.

Pope Pius his Epistle to Justus Viennensis Censured as Spurious; and if it was Genuine, cannot serve the Presbyterian Design, p. 56.

The Instance of Marcion the Heretic as unfit to support the New Doctrine, as the former Testimony from the Spurious Epistle of Pope Pius, p. 57.

The Testimony from Justin Martyr imperitiously alledged by our Adversaries, p. 58, 59.

The Testimony of the Gallican Martyrs, p. 62, 63.

The

The CONTENTS.

The Testimony of St. Cyprian, p.64.

The Testimony from the Authority of St. Jerome, p. 65.

The Error of St. Jerome discovered to be very different from the New Doctrine of the Presbyterians, p.66.

St. Jerome never acknowledged any Interval, after the Death of the Apostles in which Ecclesiastical Affairs were managed, Communi Presbyterorum Consilio. Ibid & Seqq.

St. Jerome taught, that Episcopacy was the Apostolical remedy of Schism, from p.65. to p.80.

The Testimony from the Authority of Saint Austin, examined.

Saint Austin reasoned from the Succession of single Persons governing the Church of Rome from the days of the Apostles, and by this Argument overthrew the Doctrine and Schism of the Donatists, p.81. to p.94.

C H A P. II.

Of the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, p94.

Some Presbyterian Concessions preliminary to the true State of the Controversie, p.95, 96.

The Apostolical Office considered, with regard to its Permanent and Essential Nature.

2ly. As it was adorned with Extraordinary and miraculous Advantages.

The CONTENTS.

The First was to continue for ever in the Church, the Second was Transient and Occasional, with regard to the first Plantations of Christianity. The Apostolical and Episcopal Office the same in its Original Nature, Essence, and Design, p 98,99,100,101, &c.

The true State of the Controversie, whether the Apostles left the Government of Particular Churches to single Successors, or to a College of Presbyters acting in Parity and Equality, p.105,106,

The first is affirmed by all Records, whether we consider the inspired Writings of the Apostles, or the Ecclesiastical Histories of after Ages, p.107, &c.

The true Notion of an Evangelist altogether different from the Permanent Office of Timothy or Titus, p.111.

Saint James the Just, Established Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles, and he in that City was the Centre. of Unity, and Episcopal Succession in that See, p. 112,113.

The Episcopal Power lodged in his Person,ib.

The Angels of the Asiatic Churches, Bishops in the strictest Sense, p.114, &c.

The whole Question reduced to three Enquiries, p. 118, &c.

The Force of the Primitive Argument against Hereticks, from the Succession of single Persons, p. 123,124,125.

The Ancients could not be deceived in an affair of this Nature, p.128,129. The

The CONTENTS.

The Impossibility of changing the Ecclesiastical Government from Parity to Prelacy, in the Primitive Ages, all things duly considered, p. 136, 137.

This proved at length from the Concessions of the Learned Presbyterians, Salmasius, Blondel, and Bochartus, Ibid.

The Peevishness of our Adversaries in this Controversie, p. 150.

The Epistles of St. Ignatius overthrow the Pretences of Parity, even upon Salmasius his own Hypothesis, p. 152, 153, &c.

The whole Controversie reduced to Nine plain Queries, p. 157, 158, 159, 160.

The Power of Bishops over the Subordinate Clergy and Lay-men, in the Primitive Ages, p. 161.

The Presbyterian exception against large Diocesses discussed, p. 162, 163, 164.

Saint James the Just, a Diocesan Bishop in the Strictest Sense, p. 164, 165.

CHAP. III.

Of several other New Opinions propagated by the Presbyterians of Scotland, p. 168.

Their Doctrine concerning the Holy-Days of our Saviour's Nativity, Resurrection, and Ascension, Ibid.

Anniversary Solemnities not found upon any Divine or Express Institution observed in the Jewish and Christian Church, p. 172, &c.

The CONTENTS.

Presbyterian Exceptions removed, p. 175, 176, 177.

This further Prosecuted from several other Considerations, p. 179, 180, &c.

The Festivity of Christmas more particularly considered, p. 185.

The Vindicator's Mistakes exposed, by the Anniversary Commemoration of the Martyrs, celebrated by the first Christians, p. 188, &c.

The New Explications of the Vindicator insisted on, p. 196, &c.

Some other ridiculous Fancies examined, viz. That Christmas was observed in honour of Julius Cæsar, p. 205.

The Testimony cited from Buchanan cannot serve the Presbyterian Design, p. 207, 208.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Presbyterian Notion of Schism, and their fabulous Stories concerning a Presbyterian Church in Scotland, in the first Ages of Christianity, p. 211.

Several Considerations proposed to prove our Scottish Presbyterians Schismatics from the Catholic Church, in the strictest Sense of that Word, p. 213, 214, &c.

A Particular Enquiry into that Fabulous Story propagated by our Adversaries, viz. That there was a Presbyterian Church in Scotland in the First Ages of Christianity, p. 228, 229.

The

The CONTENTS.

The Authors cited by the Vindicator of the Kirk, to support this Dream, particularly considered, p. 230.

The Authority of Prosper mistaken, and the Testimony cited by our Adversaries, from his Chronicon Consulare, more narrowly enquired into, p. 245, &c.

C H A P. V.

The Presbyterian Doctrine concerning Rites and Ceremonies examined. p. 250, 251.

Their Notions contradict the Practice of all civiliz'd Nations, Ibid.

The frequent Allusions to uncommanded significant Ceremonies practised in the Worship of God, that we meet with in the Holy Scriptures, prove such Ceremonies Lawful beyond all Contradiction, p. 254, &c.

Several Exceptions, offered by the Vindicator, removed, p. 256, 257.

The Orthodox Principle Prov'd from an Allusion to the Ceremony of Immersion, practis'd in the Apostolical Church of Rome, proved from Rom. 6. 4. pag. 265.

Of Presbyterian Ordinations, and how little can be said in their Defence, p. 276, &c.

The Doctrine of Non-Resistance, truly Understood, is safe and Christian in it self, and in all its tendencies, p. 284, 285.

The Enthusiastic Singularities of the later Pres-

The CONTENTS.

Presbyterians, in rejecting all Publick Forms, in the Solemn Worship of God, reproved, p. 289, 290, 291, &c.

Calvin's three Arguments for Publick Liturgies are Solid and Unanswerable, p. 293, 294, 295.

The Vindicator's usual Reproach, viz. That the Clergy of our Church are Superstitious, examined, p. 295, &c.

The Nature of Superstition explain'd, and a Parallel insisted on, between the Superstitious Usages of the Ancient Hereticks, and the Modern Practices of the later Sectaries, p. 296, 297, 298, &c.

The Vindicator's Attempt to Justifie his Unaccountable Paradox forc'd upon the words of St. Jerome, from some Expositions offered by the Learned Grotius. Chastised and Exposed, and the Vanity of that Comparison demonstrated, p. 305, 306, 307.

The Conclusion.

Exhorting all the true Sons of the Church to Pray for the Peace and Unity of its Members.

It is expected the Reader will Pardon
some Points and Comma's that are
misplac'd. The Errors that disturb
the Sense most, are these following.

PAge 16. l. 20. r. New. p. 20. marg. r. locum. p. 55.
l. 20. r. Præcipue. p. 60. marg. for Hadriani, r. Sa-
turnini. p. 74. l. 21. r. genuine. p. 81. l. 26. r. needs.
p. 84. l. 17. r. Hieronymo. p. 92. l. 15. r. Smeſtimnus.
p. 116. l. 3. after Angel, add, as it is render'd by the
Septuagint. p. 138. l. 21. r. Centesimum. p. 159. l. 2. r. a.
p. 162. l. 5. r. Sæculi. p. 182. l. 19. r. acuteness. p. 189. l. 7.
r. accurate. p. 199. l. 3. r. foppish. p. 253. l. 28. r. Trea-
tises. p. 255. l. 25. after unguarded, add, and not Sup-
ported. p. 291. l. 13. after that, add, it. p. 319. l. 2. r. Sha-
dow.

A N

E N Q U I R Y

I N T O T H E

New Opinions, &c.

Sir,

I Thought that our Enemies had made an end of their Libels, but I see that it is not so easie for them to forbear the practises that we complain of. The malignity of Faction is endless, and there is nothing so apt to be oppressed and reviled as Truth and Innocence. We must (in these days of Atheism and Confusion) arm our selves against Calumnies and Contradictions: and if we are not guarded by Resolution and Fortitude, we must desert (not only the Peculiar Ministries of the Priesthood, but)

B the

An Enquiry into

the Profession of Christianity it self. We are surrounded on all hands by the most ungenerous and spiteful Adversaries, the open and scandalous Sensualities of some, and the spiritual Raveries of others, lay siege to the Foundations of our Faith, and it is with great difficulty that the publick Worship of God is not quite extinguished, as it is indeed despised and ridicul'd: So grievous is our present Calamity, that the contending Parties amongst us do impute our Disasters to different Causes, and therefore we are the further remov'd from our true Cure. If we were so impartial as to acknowledge our Iniquities with Sorrow and Remorse, we would quickly find the Exercise of Contrition and Repentance more proper to remove the marks of God's Anger, than the other Methods that are most pleasing to Flesh and Blood.

There is nothing more Essential to Natural Religion than the belief of God's wise and watchful Providence. It interposes in the meanest Accidents of humane Life, and much more in the remarkable Ruins and Calamities of publick Societies and Churches: And if we do not hear *the Voice of the Rod, and of him that hath appointed it*, he hath still more terrible Plagues in reserve for us than the spoiling of our Goods, or the affronting

of our Persons. Let us therefore draw near unto him by our fervent Prayers, and ingenuous Humiliations: for the most Innocent amongst us may find in the view of his Life several Actions and Omissions very displeasing to our Heavenly Father, as well as unsuitable to our Baptismal Vows and Engagements; therefore the Hand of God is stretched out against us, and he is provoked to let loose amongst us a Spirit of Error and Confusion: and though we may be very Innocent as to the Accusations of those who have wickedly combin'd to defame us, yet *who of us can understand his Errors?*

If all things without us are in such disorder, then is it high time for us to look within our selves, and to fix our Thoughts on their true Objects: If we are expos'd to the sadest Tossings and Uncertainties, we must endeavour to establish the Tranquillity of our mind? If we know not where to lay our head, if we have no *property* upon Earth, the natural Conclusion is, to *seek those things that are above*. If here we are persecuted and oppressed, we must carry our thoughts and desires to that invisible Sanctuary that yields true Ease and Repose under all prestures and afflictions.

It is worth our while to enquire, why we, who have been dedicated to the ser-

An Enquiry into

vices of the Altar, are more particularly struck at than others. It is not so much our business to complain of our Persecutors, as to look unto him that smites us : and if he (by the discipline of so many crosses) oblige us to consider more narrowly the frame of our Souls, we may with greater ease part with our former Conveniencies. Let every one of us retire into himself, and open up the several foldings of his own Conscience, and endeavour hereafter to regulate our Actions by true and Christian Principles, knowing that *all things are naked and open to the Eyes of him with whom we have to do*, and to whom we are shortly to give an account of our time and talents, and of *all things that we have done in the body whether they be good or evil*. If we must suffer, let us imitate the Captain of our Salvation : this is Edifying to the Church, and it establishes the Composure of our own mind. Let us canvass and examine the *Doctrines* and *Practices* for which we suffer, and enquire whether they be not the Principles of the Catholic and Primitive Church in her first and purest ages.

We must not think that we are discharg'd from the peculiar Offices of our Ministry, because we are forc'd from our Residence, and expos'd to all sorts of Indignities.

the New Opinions, &c.

3

dignities. We must firmly believe that *all things work together for good to them that love God*: and that our Patience and Meekness may be of greater use to the Church than if we had been allow'd to continue in our former Stations. We see how much holy things are contemn'd in our days, how triumphantly Atheism and Impiety lift up their Banners every where. Let us endeavour as much as is possible to preserve some Remains of Religion amongst the People. Let us assert the ancient Order and Piety that made the Christian Church so beautiful in former Ages.

The Apostle informs us, that the time would come when men could not *enquire* ^{2 Tim 4 3, 4.} *sound Doctrine, but after their own lust shall they hearken to themselves Teachers having itching Ears, and they shall turn away their Ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.*

The great Founder of our Religion sent his Apostles by sound Doctrine to enlighten the World, and they convey'd this Spiritual Authority unto others who should transmit it by an orderly Succession; and as their Mission was Heavenly in its Original, so their Doctrine was pure and holy in all its Tendencies. They considered themselves as the Ambassadors of Jesus Christ, and Delivered their Commission without any Mixture or Hypocrisy.

pocriſy. They treated the People with all Humility and Tenderneſs, but in the mean time took great care to mortifie their Luſts and their Paſſions : but when they grew wanton and headſtrong, and thought themſelves too wiſe to be led by their Spiritual Guides and Rulers, then they would have teachers of their own, Men choſen by themſelves, ſuch as were taught to calculate their Doctrines to popular Fancies and Humours, ſuch as would prostitute the Goſpel, to promote Error and Deluſion, and make the Kingdom of *Light* ſubſervient to that of *Darkneſs*, and inſtead of ſerving our bleſſed Saviour, they became Slaves to the People, by whom they were originally employed : and becauſe they were ſo unhappily ſucceſſful as to gratifie their Luſts, they were therefore voted the moſt edifying teachers.

The Primitive Miniſters of Religion had their immediate Commiſſion from Heaven, accordingly they endeavoured by all means to reſtore the Image of God in the Souls of Men, to raiſe their Thoughts and Deſigns to that Happineſs and Treasure which the World cannot give, which God hath promiſed and made ſure by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead. The other had their authority from Men,
and

and therefore they must needs please the People who sent them. They must reconcile the Rules and Morals of the Gospel, to the Wicked Practices and designs of the World : they must change the strictest Maxims of the *Evangel* into looser Theorems, and the severe Discipline of the Ancient Church unto all Licence and Luxury, the true faith that works by love unto airy Notions and Mistakes. Thus the People were pleas'd, and the Gospel was defeated, the Church is ruin'd, and God dishonour'd.

Every Man in his own station is obliged to contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints. When the Foundations of Ecclesiastical Unity are shaken loose, and the Antient Constitutions trampled upon with great Insolence and Impiety, then the hedge of true Religion is not only Invaded but Demolished, and without those Sacred Vehicles it must Evaporate into Giddiness and Enthusiasm ; the Extravagance of these last days is boundless as it is Sceptical, and Christianity it self is more dangerously wounded by the Delusions of some that are Baptiz'd, than by the open Blasphemies of Infidels : The last may be assaulted by *Reason*, (at least in their more Lucid Intervals) but the first are altogether inaccessible : we must not

presume to instruct them who pretend to extraordinary Illuminations, their Errors are made strong by their vanity, they plead a *Divine Right* to every *New Opinion*, and if we approach them in the ancient Paths of Modesty and Humility, they look down upon us with Scorn and Indignation; Nay, they are inflexible to the plainest and most convincing arguments.

I have frequently, with Grief and Sorrow, considered the Decays of Religion, and the Difficulties of our Employment. We must pull down *strong Holds* and *lofty Imaginations*, and grapple with the rudest Oppositions; the Avenues of Mens Souls are blockaded by passion and prejudices and they are fortified in their Error, not only by the Corruption of their Nature, but by the artifice of Seducers, their itching Ears are pleased, their Lusts are gratified, their Passions are made more unruly, their Envy, Hatred, and Malice are indulg'd; and they are allow'd to distinguish themselves from all others by special Titles of *Division* and *Singularity*, by which alone they think to make their *Calling* and *Election* sure.

Yet notwithstanding that we are thus resisted by the Multitude of their Follies and Delusions, we must not give over by faintness

Faintness and Despondency. We must plead with them, who have left the Unity of the Church, by the words of Truth and Soberness, and exhort others to continue in that Doctrine that was reveal'd by our Saviour, taught by his Apostles, and received by all Churches in the first and best Ages, that the present Generation may not rise in Judgment against us for our Silence, nor Posterity censure our Cowardice. We must not be ashamed of the truth, even when it is contradicted with all possible Violence and Fury.

I address this short Treatise to you, with a design rather to assert the Truth, than to reply to what hath been lately published by the *Vindicator* of the Kirk of *Scotland*, against a certain Book, Entitled, *Apology for the Clergy, &c.* though I think it necessary to make some of his Mistakes a little more apparent.

There are certain Practices and Rituals received by the Christian Church, in all Ages, which are not determin'd expressly in the Holy Scriptures in so many Letters and Syllables, yet by the plainest and most undeniable Consequences, are agreeable to its general Rules, and the Uniform belief of all Christians; and they that deny those Usages, or the Lawfulness of those Rituals, venture upon untrodden Paths,
and

and do foolishly condemn the Wisdom of all former Ages.

The special Providence of God hath so watch'd over the Church, that, since the first Plantations of Christianity, we have preserved to us some Records and Monuments of its Doctrine and Practices. The Books of such as have been learn'd in every age do plainly demonstrate that the first Christians were agreed amongst themselves in the great Articles of Religion, and in the general Rules of Ecclesiastical Discipline and Order, and by this Uniformity of Doctrine and Rituals they strengthened themselves against Infidels and Hereticks. There is nothing more opposite to the spirit of true Religion than Stubborness and Petulance, and when we despise those Constitutions that have been universally received amongst Christians, we overthrow the Foundations of Peace and Charity, and consequently we exclude our selves from the visible fellowship of Christ's Household and Family.

When we consider the Schisms and Tumults of particular Churches, the confusions of so many Revolutions, the shakings of so many Nations, the boldness and activity of Hereticks, we have reason to adore the Goodness of God, that so many Monuments of Ecclesiastical Antiquity

quity are preserv'd ; and whatever is uniformly determin'd by the Wisest and the best of Christians (their learn'dst Bishops and Presbyters) must be received as the Infallible truth of God, else we have no certain Standard to distinguish the Catholic Church in former Ages from the combinations of Hereticks : these are new in their several Errors and Delusions, and upon that very account of their Novelty were expos'd and refuted by the Ancients : they neither agreed amongst themselves, nor with the Orthodox. But the Uniform Voice of Christendom in the first and purest Ages, is the best Key to the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles and their Successors.

If it appear then that the Opinions which we oppose, and are propagated by the *Presbyterian* Societies are such as were never entertain'd in the Christian Church for fourteen hundred Years after our Saviour's Incarnation, then I leave it to every sober Christian to consider, whether he may safely continue in the communion of that Party that despises the whole Catholic Church both Ancient and Modern.

C H A P. I.

The Novelty and Insufficiency of those Pleas and Arguments managed by the Presbyterians in defence of their New Doctrine of Parity.

THE first Opinion that I charge with Error and Novelty amongst our Country-men, is this, That they affirm, upon all Occasions, that our Saviour hath appointed his Church, under the New Testament (whether Provincial, National, or Oecomenic) to be govern'd by the several classes of Presbyters acting in perfect Parity, and owning no Subordination to any higher Officer in the Ecclesiastical Senate above a Presbyter in the modern and current Notion of the word, Such a Doctrine must be of dangerous consequence, because it is altogether new, and never propagated in any part of the Christian Church until these last days of *Separation* and *Singularity*. In this Opinion they differ, not only from the Uniform testimony of Antiquity, but also from the first Presbyterians amongst our
selves,

selves, who declare in their Confession of Faith, that all *Church-Polity* is variable: so far they were at that time from asserting that indispensable, divine, and unalterable *right* of Parity.

All that the first Presbyterians pleaded was, that their new form was allowable, and not repugnant to the Oeconomy of the New Testament and Primitive Institution; and that it came very near to the Original Model of Churches, but they never thought to advance such a bold and rash Assertion as to affirm, That the Christian Church, by the Original Authority of our Saviour and his Apostles, ought to be govern'd in all Ages by a Parity of Presbyters; or that there was no other Officer in the Church could pretend to any share of Ecclesiastical Government above a Presbyter.

When a Society of Men set up for Divine, Absolute, and Infallible Right, they ought to bring plain Proofs for what they say, else they must needs be look'd upon as Impostors, or at least self-conceited and designing Men. To propagate a Doctrine under the notion of a probable Opinion (though it should happen to be an Error) is consistent with Modesty, and the practice of Learned Men in all Ages: But to affirm a new Notion to be established by
Divine

Divine Right, and to require Obedience to that Scheme, as a thing that is due to Supreme and Infallible Authority, is much worse than Speculative Enthusiasm. If a man only entertains himself with his Visions and Fancies, he alone suffers by it : but if I meet with a company of headstrong Fellows, who must needs persuade me that they see so many Armies in the Air fighting, and with the exactest Discipline of War ; nay, their Banners, the shape and colour of their Horses, their several Squadrons, and the whole order of their Encampment, and will certainly knock me in the head unless I take my Oath upon it that I see all this, who never saw any such thing in my Life, I think I have reason to complain that my Circumstances are very unlucky, I had certainly rather fall into the hands of High-waymen, than amongst those Spiritual Robbers, who divest me of my Senses, and the exercise of my Reason.

If you inform our Country men that their New Doctrine is thus represented, they will tell you that none but wicked men oppose their Government ; that it is Establish'd upon the express Institution of our Saviour, that it hath been asserted and prov'd by several Learned Men of their Party beyond contradiction. But if you ask

ask by what particular argument you may be convinc'd of the Truth of their New Doctrine, then they begin to lead you into a Labyrinth of dark and intricate Consequences, obscure and perplext Probabilities; several Texts of Scripture they will alledge, but sadly wrested and distorted from their genuine Meaning and Design, and the uniform Suffrages of all the Ancients: And if you are not satisfied with such proofs as they advance, you must be contented to submit to their Censure, and the New Discipline must be Obey'd wherever their Power is equal to their Pretences.

I can give you but a short History of their Arguments by which they endeavour to Establish their Divine Right of Parity. When you read their Books I think all their pleas of whatever kind or force may be reduc'd to these three heads. First, either they pretend that this Parity of Presbyters is expressly commanded by our Saviour; or, secondly, They endeavour to support it by consequences from several Texts of Scripture; or thirdly, from the Testimonies of the ancient Writers of the Church.

First I say, they pretend that this Parity of Presbyters (exclusive of the Superiority or Jurisdiction of a Bishop) is expressly

expresly commanded by our Saviour. This indeed promises very fair; For if our Saviour hath plainly and positively Comanded that Ecclesiastical Affairs shall be managed in all Churches and Ages *communi Presbyterorum consilio*, and by such a College of Presbyters as excludes the Authority and Jurisdiction of a Bishop, then, without all Controversie, all Christians are oblig'd to submit to it. The Consequence is plain and undeniable; and because our Country-men do insist upon this more frequently than any of the foreign Presbyterians, we ought to hear them calmly and deliberately; and when they plead the Authority of our Blessed Saviour we must view those Texts with reverence and attention, and see if any thing can be inferred from them that may probably support the now Scheme of Presbytery.

The Parallel Texts of Scripture are,

Vid. Dickson in Matth. 20. 25. But Jesus called them unto him and said, ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. v. 26. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your Minister. v. 27. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant. v. 28. Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministred unto but to minister, and to give his

his life a ransom for many. See also *Mark 10, v. 42, 43, 44, 45.* and *Luke 22, 25.* From these parallel Places they plead, that the Officers of Christ's House were by his own exprefs Command establish'd in a perfect Equality, even in such a Parity as excludes the Power and Jurisdiction of any higher Order than that of a Presbyter in the modern Notion.

Let us now examine, whether there be any Foundation for their Inference in the Texts last mentioned.

In the first place, we find that our Blessed Saviour supposes Degrees of Subordination amongst his own Disciples, as well as all other Societies, and therefore he directs the Ecclesiasticks, who would climb to the Highest Places in the Church, to take other Methods than those that are most usual amongst the Grandees of the World: He that deserved Preferment in the Church was to be the Servant of all, so that this Text refers to the Method of Promotion, and not to the Extirpation of their Jurisdiction. They were not to aspire to Honour and Dignity by Force and Violence, or the other Arts that are so fashionable in Secular Courts, but rather by all the Acts of Modesty, Humility, and Self-denial.

Next, let me ask, whether the Apostles understood this Precept of our Saviour in the sense of our Adversaries or not. If they did, (as it is alledg'd) how came they to exercise Jurisdiction over all Subordinate Ecclesiasticks, during their Life time, in all the Churches they Planted? Did they go cross to the Institution of our Saviour, who perfectly understood his meaning, and to whom the Precept was Originally delivered.

But that which Baffles and Exposés this Argument to all Intents and Purposes, is this, that *he* did *that* himself among them, which now *he* commanded them to do to one another, and therefore the doing of this towards one another in Obedience to the Command now under consideration, could not infer a Parity, unless they Blasphemously infer that Christ and his Apostles were equal: for when you read the Text with attention, you see that our Saviour recommends what he Enjoyns from his own Constant and Visible Practice amongst them, *viz.* that he himself, who was their *Lord and Master*, was their *Servant*, and therefore it became the Greatest among them, in imitation of him, to be Modest, Calm, and Humble towards all their Subordinate Brethren, and this qualify'd them
more

more than any other thing for Ecclesiastical Promotions.

It is very sad that any should be so much Infatuated with their new Schemes of Parity, as to alledge such Texts, which (if understood in their Sense) Degrades our Blessed Saviour to the Degree of one of his Disciples; for what he Commanded the Apostles, he Practised among them himself. And this is the strongest Motive to engage their Obedience; therefore I may reasonably infer, that whatever it was that our Saviour commanded in those places of Scripture, it must of necessity be *toto cælo* different from all Parity and Equality. He Commanded them, that they should not exercise their Jurisdiction as the Lords of the Gentiles did, by a Spirit of Pride and Domination, but rather by the more Christian and engaging Behaviour of Charity and Humility. He that was to be the Greatest among them, was to be their Servant, in Imitation of that Heavenly Patern that was set them by our Blessed Lord and Saviour. *S. Paul* thought himself oblig'd to answer his Episcopal Character after this manner, when the Care of all the Churches lay upon him, when he employ'd his *Apostolical* Power to promote the Edification of all Men:

and all the Fathers of the Church, who were advanc'd above their Brethren to Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction, had this Evangelical Notion of their Dignity, that they were the Servants of all others.

From what hath been said one may easily see, that there is no Ground, no not a Shadow of any Argument for the New Doctrine in these Texts of Scripture. It is true, that *Salmasius* glances at this way of Reasoning in his *Walo Messalinus*, but he lays no great stress upon it. That which is most to our purpose is, that *Beza* himself, in his larger Notes upon the New Testament, asserts, that all kind of Jurisdiction is not forbidden in these Texts, but that only which is joyn'd with imperious Bitterness and Domination.

*vid. Bez. in
locum.*

Let it be further considered, that the Hierarchy and Subordination of Priests was Established by Divine Authority in the Jewish Church: and if our Saviour had pull'd down that ancient Polity, and commanded an Equality amongst the Presbyters of the New Testament, he would not have stated the Opposition between his own Disciples and the Lords of the Gentiles, but rather between the Priests of the Mosaic Oeconomy and the Disciples

Disciples of the New Testament: When he reprov'd the corrupt glosses that were introduc'd into the Church by the Scribes and Pharisees, and taught them Purer and more Heavenly Strains of Morality, he states the Opposition between the current Doctrine receiv'd amongst the Jews, and that which he himself Taught and Recommended; and there is no doubt to be made, if he had forbidden the several Degrees and Subordinations of Priests, and Established a perfect Equality, he would have stated a plain Opposition between the Model of the Temple, and the other Plat-form that was to succeed in the Christian Church.

As for the other Text that is ordinarily cited to serve the same design, 1 Pet. 5:2,3. It is but the Apostle's Commentary on our Saviour's Words and Commandment, and it forbids the Spirit of *Pride* and *Insolence*, as a thing very unsuitable to all Power and Authority in the Church. Thus such Texts have been understood from the beginning, and it is one strong Prejudice against the new Exposition, that it was never heard of until these latter days.

Secondly, If the Presbyterians cannot Establish their *Divine Right* upon express Texts of Scripture, they will support it

(as they think) by the Clearest and most immediate Consequence, and this is Equivalent to the most Positive Command and Institution. The Argument from the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter fill all their Books from top to bottom: And if this be in it self Lame and Sophistical, they must despair to Establish the pretended Equality of Presbyters in the Ecclesiastical Government.

The Argument most insisted on in favour of their Parity, (exclusive of Episcopal Jurisdiction) is built upon the *Homonymy* of Bishop and Presbyter in the Language of the New Testament, or because the Clergy are *Dichotomiz'd* only into Bishops and Deacons in some Texts of Scripture, and in some Ancient Writers of the Primitive Church. Hence they exclude the Authority of a Bishop above a Presbyter, though the *Offices* themselves be as much distinguished as is possible in several Texts of the New Testament. And if this Argument alone appear Childish and Sophistical, they have not another Sanctuary to flee to; so my present Business is to Examine the force of it. There is not one of their number with whom you Engage in this Controversie, but immediately he will tell you, that there is no distincti-

on

Vid. Smectim.

Fus divin. Mi-

nister Anglican.

The Unbishopsing

Timothy and

Titus.

Altare Damas-

cen.

Durb. Dissert.

on the Revel.

V. Cotel. Not.

in priorum Epist.

S. Clem. p. 96.

in quibus fuse

& solide demon-

stratur argu-

mentum a con-

fusionem nomi-

num nequa-

quam Jurisdi-

ctionem & Au-

thoritatem Epif-

coporum supra

Presbyteros la-

icorum posse

on between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in the Scriptures, and therefore they conclude that their Argument *a Confusione Nominum* against the Superiority of a Bishop is very Solid and Demonstrative. To this purpose they cite *Act. 20. 17. 28. Philip. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3.* and several other places.

Whether a Bishop be of a Higher Order than a Presbyter does not now fall under our Enquiry, nor is it in it self very material. Sometimes they might be consider'd of the same Order with regard to the Priesthood common to either, by which both Bishops and Presbyters were distinguish'd from the body of the People, and other Subordinate Officers of the Church, though at other times, when Authority and Jurisdiction is nam'd, the Bishop, (with regard to his Dignity and Power) is always reckon'd above a Presbyter.

Here we are carefully to Observe, that when the Inspir'd Writers *Dichotomiz'd* the Clergy into two Orders, they but follow'd the Dialect and Example of the Jews, who thus divided their Ministers also into Priests and Levites, though the Highest Order was again Subdivided both by the Jews and the Christians, when the Priests were consider'd with re-

gard to that Subordination establish'd among themselves, and without any regard to the Body of the People. This is very agreeable to the Language of the Ancient Jews, as well as to the Idiom of the *Hellenistical Tribes* of the Apostolical Age: The first confounded the name of the *High Priest* with that of a *Priest*, without any other distinguishing *Characteristic* or *Discrimination*. For Proof of this see *Levit. 1. 7, 8. And the Sons of Aaron the Priest shall put fire upon the Altar, and lay the wood in order upon the fire. v. 8. And the Priests Aaron's Sons shall lay the parts, the head and the fat in order upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the Altar.*

*V. Doctifs. Be-
vereg. cod. ca-
non Eccles. pri-
mit. lib. 2. c. 11.*

Here we plainly find that in the first Establishment of the Mosaic Oeconomy (in which the Patriarchal Subordination of Priests was still retain'd) the High Priest is nam'd by the same appellative (without any distinction of Order or Jurisdiction) that the other Priests were nam'd by: and the Title of a Priest was promiscuously apply'd, without any distinction or marks of Eminence to the High Priest as well as to the Subordinate. Yet it was never question'd but that there were extraordinary Privileges and Dignities reserv'd to the *High Priest* amongst
the

the Jews, though thus plac'd amongst the other Priests without any Nominal Distinction: nor do we find the Title of *High Priest* ever affix'd to the particular name of *Aaron* or *Eleazar* in all the *Pentateuch*, nor is the word *High-Priest* itself mention'd in the Books of *Moses*, but either twice or thrice, and *that* only with regard to the Administration of after days. Yet this *Homonymy* of names could not be reasonably pleaded *then* against the Subordination of other Priests to *Aaron*, nor against the Deference due to his Pontifical Character. Was it then to be expected that the Apostles or Apostolical Men (when they occasionally mention'd the Presbyters of the New Testament) might not make use of the currant Language and Pharaesology of their own Country-men, who divided their Clergy into Priests and Levites, as if there were no more but two *Orders*, even when the meanest of the Jews knew that the Dignity of the *High Priest* was very honourable, and distinguish'd from all Subordinate Priests by all marks of Eminence and Authority?

It is true, that in the *Hagiographical* and *Prophetical* Writings, the High Priest is very frequently distinguish'd by his Proper and Special Character; yet in the beginning

beginning of the *Jewish Oeconomy* neither *Aaron* nor *Eleazar* were called *High-Priests* when they are particularly nam'd, and if in those days any had been so mad as to have infer'd from this *Confusio Nominum* an Equality between all Priests, he would certainly have been expos'd: for the Offices themselves were sufficiently distinguish'd by those *Special Ministries* and *Jurisdictions* that were peculiarly appropriated to the one, and deny'd to the other, such as were visible to the observation of the meanest among the Jews.

We do not at all deny but that Bishops might be call'd Presbyters in the days of the Apostles, and justly so too, though they had other Presbyters under their Government and Inspection: for the use of the Word *Presbyter* was another thing *then* than now, if we consider it in its full Latitude and Extent. With us it signifies such Priests as assist the Bishop in his Ecclesiastical Administrations, and are accountable to him for their Performances: And though all Presbyters are not Bishops, yet all Bishops are Presbyters; and to infer an Equality of Offices from the promiscuous Use of Names, I think, is neither good Logick nor good History.

We do not now Plead, (as some Ignorant People may pretend) that there ought to be a Bishop above Presbyters, because there was a *High Priest* among the Jews, but rather thus, that the *Hierarchy* that obtain'd in the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish Oeconomy* was never abrogated in the New; and though we meet with the same *Dichotomies* of the Clergy in the New Testament, as are frequently seen in the Old, we ought not to conclude from thence, that there was an Equality among them of the Higher Order in that Division, no more than there was a Parity amongst the Priests of the Old Testament, for that same Highest Order, or *Ἱερέας*, was again divided into two, *viz.* the *Supream* and *Subordinate*.

And not only they, but the Jews also of the Apostolical Age divided their Clergy into two *Classes* when they spoke of them, only as in Opposition to the People, they made no other distinction amongst them than that of Priests and Levites: But then again, upon other Occasions they subdivided the Priests into the *Highest* and *Subordinate* Order, when they consider'd the *Hierarchy* in it self, and distinguish'd every *Ἱερέας* of the Priesthood from one another, of this we have clear Instances from *Philo* the Jew.

Vid. Clarif. Dodwell differe. Cypr. p. 205.

Was it not then reasonable; that the Apostles should speak the Language of the Age in which they lived, and *that* of their Predecessors? Whether then the Clergy be divided into their several *Classes* by a *Bipartite* or *Tripartite* division, both is very Agreeable to the Custom of the Jews. If they compar'd the Priests amongst themselves, and reckon'd up their *Distinctions* and *Subordinations* to one another, then they were Divided by a *Tripartite* Division; but if they spoke of them with regard to the People, then the *Bipartite* Division was more Convenient, so that the Community of Names was very observable when the *Offices* themselves were as truly Separated and Distinguished as they could be. In like manner the first Presbyter, or *Πρεσβυτερος*, in the Apostolical Age, he that was Vested with a *Prostasia*, was as much above the Subordinate Presbyters as the *High-Priest* among the Jews was above other Priests, with whom nevertheless he was frequently Ranked, without any Nominal Distinction or Discrimination.

Nay, *Salmasius* himself grants, that even when the pretended Equality prevail'd. there was a *Præses* to whom the *Protocathedria*, or *Locus in confessu Primarius*, was constantly due, and that during life.

And

And there are such manifest and palpable Evidences of this peculiar Honour and Jurisdiction due to one of the Ecclesiastical Senate in the Apostolical Age, that the Learned'st Sticklers for Parity cannot deny it. The *Apocalyptic* Angels (amongst whom we justly reckon *S. Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*) the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the Catalogues of Bishops succeeding the Apostles in several Sees, (gathered at least towards the middle of the Second Century) make it Evident beyond all Contradiction.

It is impossible to let us see from any Ancient Record either Genuine or Suppositious, that there was ever any thing of Moment *Canonically* determin'd in the Ecclesiastical Meetings without their Bishop his particular Advice and Authority. And since *Clemens Romanus*, *Origen*, and *S. Cyprian* do compare the Evangelical Priesthood and Ministrations with the Aaronical, how is it that we can pretend to Conclude an Equality amongst the Presbyters of the New Testament from the *Dichotomies* us'd in Christian Writings, no more than we can Dream of a Parity among the Jewish Priests, because they are frequently *Dichotomiz'd*, especially since the Ancients, who sometimes divide the Clergy only into two Orders,
do

do again upon other occasions Subdivide the Highest Order, and distinguish the Bishop from all Subordinate Presbyters.

It is true, that *Clemens Romanus* a Writer of the Apostolical Age, Divides the Clergy into two Orders, but so he Divides also the Jewish Ministers of the Sanctuary into Priests and Levites, which no Man will allow as a Proof of the Equality of Priests under the Old Testament; but I shall have Opportunity hereafter to consider the Testimony alledg'd by *Blondel* from *S. Clemens's* Epistle to the *Corinthians* more particularly in its proper Place. I have formerly said, that the most Ancient Writers, who *Dichotomize* the Clergy when they speak of them with regard to the Laity, do yet distinguish them by a *Tripartite* Division, when the *Hierarchy* is consider'd in it self, and with regard to that *Prostasia* and Jurisdiction which distinguishes one Priest from another. *Tertullian* in his Book *de Baptismo*, hath these Words, *Jus quidem dandi baptismum habet summus Sacerdos qui est Episcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi Auctoritate, quâ salvâ salva pax est*: Yet Monsieur *Blondel* runs away with another Testimony cited from his Apologues, as if he had found there a perfect Equality

Tertul. de Baptismo.

Equality of Presbyters, because the *Seniores* are said to be in the Government, than which there cannot be a more absurd Consequence, for he neither affirm'd that those *Seniores* were all Equal among themselves, nor is it certain, whether by the *Seniores* he understood all Presbyters in General, or those only who were advanc'd to the Episcopal Dignity; for it was no part of his Business in an Apology Address'd to the Heathens to insist on the *Subordinations* of one Priest unto another, for he only pleaded that there was nothing in the Christian Meetings contrary to the strictest Rules of Morality and Decency, and that they were Men of Approv'd and Exemplary Lives who were advanc'd to any share of the Ecclesiastical Government.

Clemens Alexandrinus is brought as a Witness to serve the same Design, but then unluckily he reckons up the three Orders of the Clergy, and calls them *Imitations of the Angelical Glory*, *Μιμήματα τῆ ἀγγελικῆς δόξης.* *Stromat. Lib. 6.*

Upon this Occasion it is needless to name *S. Cyprian*, who Asserts the Jurisdiction and Prerogative of the Episcopal Power upon all Occasions with great Courage and Assurance; and *S. Polycarp* the Famous Doctor of the *Asiatic* Church,
Bishop

Bishop of *Smirna*, and Disciple of Saint *John*, who flourish'd long before *S. Cyprian*, though he Divides the Clergy into two Orders in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, yet he honourably mentions and recommends the Epistles of *S. Ignatius*, in which the Apostolical *Hierarchy* of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon is so often and so expressly mention'd: and *S. Polycarp* in the *Epigraph* of that Epistle distinguishes himself from his Subordinate Presbyters, according to the Modest and Usual Stile of those days, *Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him*, who, if he had stood on a Level with those Presbyters, would never have distinguish'd himself from the Community of his Brethren by his proper Name plac'd at such a distance, yet with Visible (but very Modest) Marks of Distinction and Precedence, according to the humble Practice of those Glorious Martyrs.

From what hath been said, it is very evident, that there can be nothing more Foolish and Extravagant than to conclude a Parity among Priests, because some Ancient Christians us'd the Jewish Phraseology, for even these upon other Occasions frequently Assert the *Jurisdiction* of one Bishop over many Presbyters: And *Hermas*, who was Contemporary with

with *Clemens Romanus*, reproves the Ambition of some in his own time, who strove for the first Dignity and Preferment. And if there was no such Precedence then in the Church, there was no ground for his Reprehension.

Pastor Hermæ.

The Sum of these Reasonings amounts to this, that when the *Hellenist* Jews would distinguish the *High-Priest* from the Levites, they thought the common Name of a Priest was sufficient, * as is evident from several places in *Phylo* the Jew. And as it was unreasonable to conclude from thence that he had not a singular Authority and Jurisdiction over subordinate Priests, so now-a-Days an Argument founded upon the same *Topic*, is equally Impertinent and Sophistical. When the Priests were compar'd among themselves one with another, then their Dignities and Subordinations might be seasonably mentioned. If we compare the Priests of the New Testament with the Deacons, we need say no more than Priests and Deacons; but when we compare the Priests among themselves, we must acknowledge their several *Subordinations*.

* *Apud clariss. Dodwell. dissertat. Cyprian p. 205*

The Priests under the Old Testament were only allowed to offer the Sacrifices, and by their Offering of Sacrifices, were
D distinguish'd

distinguish'd from the Levites: So under the New Testament, the Priests, both of the highest and subordinate Order, offer the *Eucharistical* Sacrifice, and by so doing, are sufficiently distinguish'd from Deacons; yet this is no Argument against the Subordination of one Priest unto another. Thus we see there was the same Reason for those *Dichotomies* of the Clergy, both under the Old and New Testament.

From what hath been said we may easily see that the Jews us'd such *Dichotomies* of their Clergy, both under the *Mosaic Oeconomy*, and in the *Apostolical Age*, when the superiority of the *High-Priest* was past all Contradiction: And there can be a very good account given of this Phraseology, and way of speaking from the different Considerations that engag'd both Jewish and Christian Writers to use the *Bipartite* or *Tripartite* Division of the Clergy; for the very same Christian Writers, who only mentioned two Orders, do in other places reckon up the *Hierarchy* of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, as plainly as is possible. From these Considerations, I say, we may easily perceive, that the Argument pleaded against Episcopacy, founded upon such *Dichotomies*, is not only Weak, but very Foolish and Extravagant. Yet

Yet *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, and *Daille*, Men of great Learning and Reputation, employ'd much Reading and Artifice to support their New Hypothesis by this Argument, and to wrest so many places of the Fathers, to promote an Opinion which was never heard of before the Days of *Aerius*; thô it must be confess'd, that Men of extraordinary Learning have been impos'd upon by the same fallacies, particularly our Country-man, *Sir Thomas Craig*, in his Book *de Success. Reg. Angl.* But if he had read the ancient Monuments of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, with that accurate Attention wherewith he perus'd the vast Volums of *Civilians*, *Canonists*, and *Historians*, he had certainly been of another Mind.

So visible is the *Confusion* of Names in the New Testament, that *Apostle*, *Bishop*, and *Presbyter*, are sometimes mentioned without any remarkable Distinction, yet so as the Government of one amongst many, is particularly Demonstrated. Our Saviour himself is call'd an *Apostle*, *Heb. 3. 1.* sometimes the Word seems to be restrain'd to the Number of Twelve, and *Matthias*, upon the Apostacy of *Judas*, is chosen to fill up the Number of the Twelve Apostles; but in the same Apostolical Writings, the Name of an *Apostle*

V. Cotel in pri-
or Epist.
S. Clemen. ad
Corinth.

1 Cor. 15. 7.

is bestow'd upon several others besides the Twelve, as S. S. *Barnabas*, *Paul Andronicus*, *Junias*, *Epaphroditus*, and others. Our Saviour is call'd a Bishop, 1 *Pet.* 2. 25. Again the Government of the Apostles is called their *Episcopacy*, 1 *Act.* 20. sometimes the Name of *Bishop* is attributed to such Priests as were of the first Order, invested with Apostolical Power and Jurisdiction, 1 *Tim.* chap. 3. *Tit.* 1. 7. these places are so understood by all the Fathers. Again the *Bishops* mentioned, 1 *Philip.* 1. are understood by St. *Chrysostom*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophilaët*, and *Theodoret*, to be the Priests of the second Order; for they concluded *Epaphroditus* to have been then Bishop of *Philippi*, as may be reasonably collected from *Philip.* 2. 25. Our *English* Version follows *Beza*, and understands it as if *Epaphroditus* had been a Messenger sent by the *Philippians* to S. *Paul*; but *Salmasius* is much more ingenious, and acknowledges, That the Word *Apostle* in the sacred Scriptures never signifies any other than *legatum Dei ad homines*.

Wale Bess.

And this is very agreeable to the Opinion of *Theodoret*, who thought that when the *Bishops* were named in the Apostolic Age, so as to be distinguished from subordinate Priests, they were then called

Apostles,

Apostles, thô upon other occasions they were promiscuously Named without any distinction. I only mention this transiently, not insisting upon it. My business at present is to prove that the Community of *Names* was so familiar in the Language of the Apostolical Age, that no Man can conclude from thence a Community of *Offices*. St. *Peter* calls himself a *Presbyter*, so St. *John* the Apostle, and the Presbytery mentioned in the first of *Timothy*, 4. 14. was a Senate compos'd of Apostles and other Presbyters, whether of the first or second Rank is not certain, but that S. *Paul* himself was one of them is evident from the second Epist. to *Timothy*, 1. 6. In the first, *Timothy* is exhorted not to neglect the Gift which was given him with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery. In the last he is put in mind to stir up the same Gift which he received by the laying on of St. *Paul's* Hands. And in the beginning of Christianity (as S. *Chryostom* Witnesseth) both Bishops and Presbyters were sometimes call'd *Deacons*, which may be justly concluded from *Coloss.* 4. 17. and the Apostles themselves are called Δι'ακονοι and in the first of the Acts, their Apostolical Ministry, to which *Matthias* was assumed, is called their *Deaconship*, 1 Act. 17.

Now I take it for granted, that if any Man pretend to infer a Community of *Offices*, from the Community of *Names*, which we meet with in the Holy Scriptures; he must needs confound the highest Order of the Church (even the Apostolical Dignity) with the lowest Rank of Ecclesiastical Officers. Yet this is certain that the several *Offices* were carefully *separated* in those Days; thô the Humility of such as were uppermost, taught them not to be very forward to distinguish themselves from their subordinate Brethren, by Titles of Eminence and Jurisdiction; and the Bishops in the second Century transcribed the same Copy in their Behaviour, who, thô they were careful to preserve the necessary Distinction between the Priests of the first and second Order, yet they studied the most modest Expressions of Humility and Condescension, as may be seen from the fore-cited Inscription of S. *Polycarp's* Epistle to the *Philippians*, that Apostolic Martyr and Prince of the *Asiatick* Church.

I have consider'd this Argument the more carefully, in that I find it over and over again in all the Writings of our Ecclesiastic *Levellers*, as their first and last Refuge to which they flee to; and yet there is not any thing more Frivolous
and

and Trifling ; for the Names of the lowest Officers in the Christian Church, were frequently assum'd by the highest, and distinction of Offices is rather interr'd from their Practices, Peculiar Ministries, and Acts of Jurisdiction, than from any Names that we can fix upon.

Thirdly, If they cannot establish their New Doctrine of Parity neither upon the express Commandment of our Saviour, nor upon the Consequences they manage a *confusione nominum*, they endeavour to support it by some Testimonies of the Primitive Fathers. When the Government and Revenues of the Church were sacrilegiously invaded by *Atheists* and *Enthusiasts* under *Oliver Cromwel*, the Learned *Blondel* employed all his skill to make the Ancients contradict themselves and all contemporary Records. When his *
 Book appeared, the Presbyterians concluded (before ever they Read it) that all was Pure and Undeniable Demonstration; and our Country-men think they need return no other answer to any thing that is written against them, than to say that *Episcopacy*, and all that may be said in its defence, is quite Ruin'd and Destroyed by *Monfieur Blondel*, and *Salmasius*. And thô there are but very few of them that ever read them, and that every

*Apolog. pro
 senten. Hiero-
 nym. Amstel.
 1646.*

every Line of their Writings, that hath the least colour of Argument, was frequently Answered and Expos'd, yet such is the Power of Prejudice and Partiality, that they shut their Eyes against the clearest Evidences that are produc'd by their Adversaries. It's enough for them to say that *Blondel* hath written a Book in their Defence, of 549 pages; and this in their Opinion may bar all Disputations of that Nature. When we bid them name the place that they think proves their New Doctrine most plausibly, they refuse any such close Engagement; they will tell you that *Jerome* was of their Opinion, and that their Learned Champion *Blondel* has sufficiently prov'd that this antient Monk was a Presbyterian.

I must not transcribe the Accurate and unanswerable Dissertations of several Learned Men, who have sufficiently expos'd the Writings of *Blondel* and *Salmasius* on this Head, particularly the incomparable Bishop of *Chester*, yet I may be allowed to examine some of the most remarkable Testimonies from Antiquity that are alledg'd by those Men to support their Doctrine of Parity, that the Reader may have a Sample of their Partialities and Prepossessions, and if none of the first *Worthies* of the Christian Church appear

appear for the New Doctrine of Parity, we may safely infer, that there are little hopes to defend their cause by the Suffrages of after Ages.

And in the next place I will particularly examine *Blondel's* Argument from the Authority of *St. Jerome* and Demonstrate that he mistakes or (which is much more probable) hides and misrepresents the Doctrine of that Learned Father; and if *St. Jerome* be not his Friend, he and his Associates may despair of any other.

First, I will examine some of the most remarkable Testimonies from Antiquity, and the first that is nam'd is *S. Clement* in his famous Epistle to the *Corinthians*. This is the Celebrated *S. Clement*, so Honourably mentioned by *S. Paul* himself, *Philip. 4. 3.* together with some others, whose Names are Written in the Book of Life, who was fellow Labourer with the Apostles, and Third Bishop of *Rome* by the Testimony of *Irenæus*, and probably sat in the Chair of *Rome* from the Year 64, until the Year 81, or 83. He wrote his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, to compose the scandalous Divisions and Schisms that had risen among them by the Pride and Vanity of some turbulent Brethren, who valu'd themselves upon the miraculous Gifts of the Spirit,

Adversus Hæreses, lib. 3. cap.

V. Doctiss. Caro. Hist. liter. p. 18.

Spirit, to the Contempt of their ordinary Ecclesiastical Governors. It is thought by some, that this Epistle was written towards the end of *Nero's* Persecution, before he was advanc'd to the See of *Rome*.

Blondel *Apolo-*
log. p. 9.
Plerique Lati-
norum (Hierony-
mo teste) secun-
dum post Petrum
fuisse putave-
runt; ut ante
annum Domini
65, ad Romanæ
Ecclesiæ clavum
sedisse necesse sit.

It is very observable that *Blondel* before he produces any Testimony from *S. Clement*, acknowledges, that by the universal consent of the Ancients, this very *S. Clement* succeeded *S. Peter* in the Government of the See of *Rome*; and tho' they vary as to his Order of Succession, yet all of them agree as to the thing it self.

His first Argument for Parity is founded on *S. Clement's* Inscription of his Epistle to the *Corinthians*. Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆ Θεῦ ἡ πα-
ρισκόσα Ρώμῃ τῆ ἐκκλησία τῆ Θεῦ περιεῖται κείνηθεν.

From this Inscription he concludes that the Church of *Rome* was then Govern'd by a Colledge of Presbyters, because the whole Church of *Rome* wrote to the whole Church of *Corinth*, not mentioning the Distinction of the Clergy from the Laity; when the Learned *Blondel* Reasoned at this rate, he design'd (it seems) to please the Independent Party, (who were then most Numerous and Potent in *England*) rather than the Presbyterians.

Apol. pro sent
Hier. p. 9.

For if his Argument proves any thing, it proves too much, *viz.* That the Laity hath

with an equal share of Jurisdiction in the Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs; with Bishops and Presbyters? And thus we might conclude, that when *S. Paul* wrote an Epistle together with *Sosthenes*, *Timotheus*, *Sylvanus*, and all the Brethren that were with him, that he had no greater Authority in the Ecclesiastical Senate, than the meanest of the Laity.

Our Learned Country-man *Junius*, gives a far more reasonable Account of his Ancient Simplicity, of the Writings of the Apostolical Age, than such Childish Reasonings; and he tells us that *St. Clement* did not prefix his Name, *ut modestiæ & humilitatis posteris ætatibus exemplar imitandum proponeret*, and this was every subservient to his Design, that he might Teach the *Corinthians*, (whom he exhorts to Concord and Humility) by his own Example, that true and undisguised Modesty, which was then so visible in the Practice of the first Christians, when both Clergy and Laity were of one heart, and one Mind.

The next attempt that *Blondel* makes to support his imaginary Parity in the Primitive Church, is from *St. Clement's*

page, 9. 10.

dividing the Clergy into *Bishops and Dea-*

Κατὰ χώρας
ἢν καὶ πλείους

πρεσβύτεροι καθίστανοντα ἀρχαίς αὐτῶν δοκιμάσαντες πρὸ πνεύματος
ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους ἢ μνημονίων πρεσβύταιν.

cons, according to the current Phraseology that prevail'd in the Apostolical Age. When they considered the Clergy only, in opposition to the body of the People. I have answer'd this already, when I examined their Argument, founded upon such *Dichotomies*: But when we consider this particular place of *S. Clement*, with regard to that Latitude, and promiscuous use of Names, that was very current in those Days, the Word *Deacon* may be understood to comprehend all those Ministers of Religion (whether Presbyters in the modern Notion, or Deacons, who by the first Institution, were obliged to attend upon Tables,) and then his Argument vanishes into nothing; nay rather it is a strong confirmation of that which he would most willingly destroy; for by *Bishops* and *Deacons*, we may understand Apostles, Bishops, Presbyters, and Attendants upon Tables; for the Word *Deacons* in the Language of the *Holy Scriptures*, is taken in the greatest Latitude that may be, not only for such as were appointed by the Apostles, particularly to the Ministry of Tables, but also the Apostles themselves, the highest Officers in the Christian Church, are called Deacons. *Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but Deacons, by whom the*

believ'

Vid. doctifs. Bevereg. Cod. Can. Eccles. Prim. lib. 2. p. 314.

1 Cor. 3. 5.

believed, even as the Lord gave to every Man? 2 Cor. 3. 6.
 And again, *who hath made us able Deacons of the New-Testament, &c.* And upon other occasions they are called Διάκονοι Θεῶ καὶ Χριστοῦ, δίακονοι τῆς διακονίης τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, &c. And those who were ordain'd to the special Ministry of Tables, were Originally constituted, that the Apostles themselves might not be diverted from the *Ministry or Deaconship of the Word.* Acts 6. 4. Crisost. 4. 7. 1 Thess. 3. 2. Coloss. 4. 17. Vid. etiam. Bevereg. ubi supra.
 And *Tychicus* is called a faithful *Deacon*, as also *Timothy*, so likewise *Archippus* is commanded to take heed to his *Deaconship*, tho' it be not expressly determined, what room he held in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, whether he was *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*; nay such was the Latitude of the Word *Deacon*, in the Apostolical Age, that it was applyed promiscuously to all the three Orders of the Christian Hierarchy. So that if we understand *St. Clement* according to the current extent of the Word, we may safely judge him to have meant by *Bishops*, the Ecclesiastical Governors, and by *Deacons*, all subordinate Ministers of Religion, whether such as were promoted to the Priesthood, or the Deacons who were confin'd to their Attendance upon Tables. What advantage then does *Monfieur Blondel* gain to his cause; for though Presbyters
 in

in the modern Notion, are not perhaps the only Persons who may be understood by the Word Deacon, yet they may be comprehended as well as other Ministers of a lower Rank.

Let it be observed also, that *S. Clement* speaks not of the Ecclesiastical Polity, such as it was brought to perfection afterwards by the Apostles, but rather of the first beginnings of the Christian Church, immediately after the Resurrection of our Saviour. For thô all the Degrees and Subordinations of the Apostolical Government, were founded upon divine Right; yet they were not in one moment established in their True and Everlasting Figure, but had their beginning, as the Jewish Church went on from lesser steps to that more perfect Scheme that was to continue until the coming of the Messiah. This is certain, that before the Apostles left the World, they established such an Ecclesiastical Government as ought to continue in the Church, until the second coming of our Saviour.

But let us suppose that where we meet with such *Dichotomies* in other Authors, such a Parity as is intended by the Presbyterians, may be understood; yet when we view the Text of *St. Clement* more narrowly, we must not presume to make
any

any such Inference, for the very same
 St. *Clement* Dichotomizes the Jewish Cler- Pag. (mibi)
 gy who are known to have had their High 40, 41.
Priest, Chief Priests, Priests, and Levites ;
 yet he comprehends them all in this short
 and *Bipartite* Division. For speaking of
Jacob he hath these Words, Ἐξ αὐτῶ γὰρ ἱε-
 ρεῖς καὶ λαοὶ τῶν πάντων λειτουργῶντες τῷ Θεῷ
 Θεῷ. And must we from hence conclude
 that there was a Parity amongst the Priests
 of the Old Testament, because they are
 thus distinguish'd from the Laity without
 mentioning the several Gradations of the
 Hierarchy amongst themselves? Nay so
 little do our Adversaries gain by straining
 the Language of St. *Clement*, contrary to
 the Latitude and Simplicity of the Apo-
 stolical Age; that the same Author com-
 prehends all Ministers of Religion, under Pag. 10. Edit.
 one general Word, whether *Prophets,* Jun.
Apostles, Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, Οἱ λειτουργοὶ
 and not only does he thus speak of the τῆς χάριτος
 Priests of the true Religion, but also of τῷ Θεῷ δια-
 the * *Egyptian Priests*, who are known πνεύματος
 to have had their several subordinati- αρχῆς, &c.
 ons.

But that which is most material to our
 purpose, is that the same St. *Clement*,
 when he exhorts the *Corinthians* to Chri-
 stian Order and Harmony, sets before
 them the beautiful Subordinations under
 the

the Temple-Service, how the *High Priest*, *Priests*, and *Levites*, were distinguished by their *Ἰδία λειτουργία*, and immediatly recommends to the *Corinthians*, that every one of them should continue *ἐν τῷ Ἰδίῳ τὰς μυστηρίαις*. Now when we consider the Primitive method of Reasoning from Jewish *Precedents*, *St. Clement* had never talked at this rate, if the Jurisdiction of one over many Priests, had been abolish'd under the New Testament, and *Jerome* himself (on whose Writings *M. Blondel* endeavours to establish his Opinion) in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, gives light to this place of *St. Clements*, *Et ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri & Diaconi venaicent in Ecclesia*. For without all Controversie, those traditions descended from the Jewish Church to the Christian, as their true inheritance.

Nay *St. Clement* himself expressly distinguishes the *Ἡγούμενοι* from the *Πρεσβυτέραι*, and the last may signifie *Office* and *Age*, both together. Nor can it be an Objection of any weight, that the first (who were there Spiritual Governors) are mentioned in the plural Number, since this was an *Encyclical* Epistle Address'd to *Corinth*, as the principal City, and from thence transmitted

P. (miki) 52,
53.

V. Cotel. Not. in
Pr. S. Clemen.
Epist. col. 95.

mitted to its dependencies. How considerable the City of *Corinth* was in those Days, every body knows; and S. *Chry-*
ostom informs us, that it was Populous and magnificent, in regard of its Riches
 and Wisdom, *καὶ τὴ ἐλλάδος τὴ κεφάλαιον*: So far was S. *Clement* from intending a Parity
 of Priests, by his promiscuous use of words, that he himself distinguishes plainly the
 Spiritual Governors from the body of subordinate Presbyters; and it is surprising
 to observe how much Men may be blinded with prejudice contrary to the Universal
 suffrage of the Ancients, who place S. *Clement* so early in the Apostolical Succession
 of the Chair of *Rome*; the Reader may see them all in one view, prefixt to *Ju-*
nius his Edition of his Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

A second Witness made to appear an evidence for Parity, is the venerable S. *Poly-*
carp, Bishop of *Smyna*, who by * *Irene-*
us Bishop of *Lions*, is said to have been taught by the Apostles, to have convers'd
 with many who had seen our Saviour, and that he himself saw him in his younger
 Days, and that he knew him to have been constituted Bishop of *Smyna*, by the
* *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3. & Polycarpus autem non solum ab Apostolis edocuit & conversatus cum multis ex eis, qui dominum nostram viderunt, sed etiam ab Apostolis in Asia, in ea que est Smyrna Ecclēsia constitutus Episcopus, quem & nos vidimus in prima nostra aetate.*

E

Apostles

An Enquiry into

Apostles. This is he who by * S. Jerome is called *totius Asiae princeps*: One would think that when they name S. Polycarp, they had discovered some clear Testimony in his Writings to build their Hypothesis upon, but instead of this, nothing but a wretched consequence founded upon the *Bipartite* Division of the Clergy, mentioned in his Epistle to the *Philippians*. And yet the *Epigraph* of S. Polycarp's Epistle clearly distinguishes him from his Presbyters, who were then with him, which runs thus, *Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him to the Church of God which is at Philippi*. And if he had not been vested with Episcopal Jurisdiction and Eminence, amongst those Presbyters, how was it agreeable to the primitive Modesty and self Denial, to have named himself only in the frontispiece of this Epistle, and to mention none of his Brethern, save only by the general name of Presbyters? This is mighty uneasy to Blondel and the evidence of Truth forces from him the following words, *id tamen in S. Martyris epistola peculiare apparet, quod eam pr. vatim suo & Presbyterorum nomine ad Philippensium fraternitatem dedit ac sibi quandam supra Presbyteros ἕμεσ' αὐτῶν, reservasse videtur ut jam tum in Episcopali apice*

Apol. p. 14.

constitutum reliquos Smyrnenſium Presbyteros gradu ſuperaffe conjicere liceat.

There are two things that baffle this shadow of an Argument brought from the Epistle of S. Polycarp. The first is that *Irenæus*, who was intimately acquainted with him, and knew him to have been taught by S. *John* the Apostle, and by him ordained Bishop of *Smyrna*, does refute the Heresies of the *Valentinians*, from the unanimous Doctrine preserv'd amongst the single successors of S. *Polycarp* downwards to that very Period in which he wrote. For if the Ecclesiastical Power of the Church of *Smyrna*, had been equally lodg'd in the College of Presbyters, his Argument against the Hereticks, from the Succession of single Persons, teaching the same Doctrine first delivered by S. *John*, and convey'd by S. *Polycarp* to the following Bishops; I say such an Argument so manag'd, could have no force, nor was it possible for *Irenæus* to have us'd it.

The next is this, that in the same Epistle of S. *Polycarp* to the *Philippians*, the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* are zealously recommended, and we need not inform the Reader how much the Divine Institution, Power, and Jurisdiction of Bishops above Presbyters is asserted in those Epistles of

which I am to speak in due time. The Question then concerning *S. Polycarp* is, whether we are to believe *S. Irenæus* Bishop of *Lions*, who was fully acquainted with the manner of his Education, Apostolical Doctrine, and promotion to the See of *Smyrna*, rather than the dark and groundless conjectures of later Ages. And from this single Instance alone, we see how inflexible and Stubborn the Power of prejudice is, how far it drives Men against Light and Conviction, and darkens all their Intellectuals in defiance of common Sense and Reason.

A third Witness alledg'd by *Blondel* is *Hermas*, (I only name some few of those that are nearest to the Apostles) I do not now enquire into the Authority of this Book. It is most probable that it was written towards the end of the Apostolical Age; and some of the Ancients of great Authority make him to be the same that is mention'd by *S. Paul*, *Rom. 16. 14*. It is without all Controversie, a Book of great Antiquity, as appears by the Citations out of him, still preserv'd in some Authentick Monuments, particularly *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*. There are two palpable evidences that Episcopacy was the Ecclesiastical Government that obtain'd in the Christian

Vid. Test. Veterum ad frontem editionis, Oxon.

stian Church, when this Book was written. The first is from the second *Vision* of the first Book, where the sending of the *Encyclical* Epistle in *exteris civitates*, is insinuated to be the peculiar Priviledge of *S. Clement*, then Bishop of *Rome*. The other insinuation is from the second Book, and 12th Mandat. Paragr. 2. where he reproves the preposterous Ambition of such as would thrust themselves into the highest dignities, contrary to the Evangelical Methods of Humility and self-denial, *exaltat enim se, & vult primam Cathedram habere*. If there be no Power, there can be no Abuse of it, and therefore he reproves that insatiable thirst of Preferment that puts some amongst them upon Projects and Designs, contrary to the command of our Saviour who taught us, that he that deserv'd the Ecclesiastical Promotion was to be the Servant of all, and therefore many of the Primitive Bishops fled and hid themselves upon the first Motion of their being nam'd to the Episcopal Dignity. And the other Citation from Book the third, *Similitud* 8. insinuates the very same thing that I intend, *viz.* a *Principatus* then established as the fixt Government of the Church which some were too too hasty to grasp.

Let us now hear the main Argument as it is proposed by Mr. *Blondel* from these words in the third *Vision ii sunt Apostoli & Episcopi, & Doctores & Ministri, &c.* Hence he concludes, that the *Doctores* can be no other than the *Episcopi*, and so there are but two Orders below the Apostles *Episcopi & Ministri*. This is Tergiversation with a Witness, since the *Presbyters* of the Primitive Church are frequently distinguished by the Name of *Doctors*, as in the *Martyrology of Sancta Perpetua & exivimus & vidimus antefores optatum Episcopum ad dexteram & Aspasium Presbyterum Doctorem ad Sinistram*. And *S. Cyprian* in his 24 Epistle *quando cum Presbyteris Doctoribus lectores diligenter probaremus*. The same Phrase is us'd by *Tertullian* also, before *S. Cyprian*, and not only in the Writings of the Primitive Ages, but also in the Histories of later Times, we find the word (*Doctor*) made use of to signifie a *Presbyter* subordinate to a *Bishop*. Thus *Radulphus de Baldoc*, *Bishop* of *London*, cited by the Learned *Usher* in his *Antiquities* of the *British Churches*, *Placuit eosdem legatos baptizari, & Catholica Fide suscepta, ordinari Eluanum in Episcopum, Medwinum autem in Doctorem*. And the word is taken in the same Sense by *Galfridus Monemuthensis*.

*V. Not. ad
Edit. Oxon:*

*V. Illustriss.
Episc. Cestr.
Vindic. S. Ignæ.
Part 2. p. 170.
171.*

*Antiq. Eccles.
Britan. p. 27.
& p. 30.*

The

The whole strength of *Blondel's* Objection, founded upon this Testimony of *Hermas*, lies in a Silly and Fraudulent Trick that he would put upon his Reader, when he endeavours to Distort the words in *Hermas* his Text, from their Natural and Genuine Construction, to something that is more subservient to the New Doctrine. The words in *Her-*

Passor Hermas
p. 20. 21. Edit.
Oxon.

mas run thus, *ii sunt Apostoli & Episcopi & Doctores & Ministri, qui ingressi sunt in clementia Dei, & Episcopatum gesserunt & docuerunt, & ministraverunt sancte & modeste Electis Dei qui dormierunt, &c.*

From these Words *Blondel* Reasons, that there are but two Degrees of the Clergy named after the Apostles, *Episcoporum qui Ecclesiis, & Diaconorum qui Ministeriis præsunt, nam Doctores ad Episcopos precipue referri cum Episcopatum gessisse dicantur.* Which Commentary is in it self a manifest Violence offer'd to the Text, for the *Doctores* are not said *Episcopatum gessisse* but *Docuisse*: and this is very agreeable to their Character, being so often and so much Employ'd by their respective Bishops in Teaching the *Catechumeni*; and the natural Position of these words will allow of no other Meaning.

Ap. p. 17.

As for the Testimony cited from Pope *Pius* the First his Epistle to *Justus Viennensis*, it deserves no particular Consideration, the Epistle it self being Supposititious; and though it were Genuine, the words Pleaded by our Adversaries do only recommend Humility to the *Bishop* of *Vien*, and by no Consequence do they insinuate any Equality between him and the *Presbyters* whom he Govern'd, *non ut majorem sed ut ministrum Christi te ob-servent*, which is nothing else but a Christian Imitation of these Words of our Saviour, *let him be the Servant of all*.

Apol. p. 19.

Another Instance alledg'd by the *Presbyterians* is this, that when the *Heretic Marcion* came to *Rome*, in the Vacancy of the *See*, after the Death of *Hyginus* before another was chosen to the *Pontificate*, this *Heretic*, I say, being Expell'd by his own Father, who was a *Bishop*, both from his Society and Ecclesiastical Communion, Pleaded with several of the College of *Presbyters* that he might be received into Communion; and from thence *Blondel* concludes that the Power of receiving into the Church such as were Excommunicated by the Episcopal Authority was lodg'd in the College of *Presbyters*. However, he was deny'd Communion, because they would not receive him

him without his Father's Allowance and Approbation : and the behaviour of those Grave Presbyters is a better *Precedent* to regulate our Opinions and Practices than the Petition of a Lewd and Profligate *Heretic*.

Nevertheless, it is very certain, that during the Vacancy of the *See*, the *Presbyters* at *Rome*, and in all other Churches, might manage the ordinary Polity and Discipline of the Church, though they never medled with such Special Acts of Jurisdiction as were always reserv'd by Constant Practice and Primitive Institution to the Episcopal Order.

From this piece of History, no Man in his Wits will conclude that the whole Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction was then lodg'd in the College of *Presbyters*, though they might preserve some Order in the *See* until another was chosen : nor is it possible for the *Presbyterians* to instance in any Church, that ever the College of *Presbyters* attempted to perform the Episcopal *distinguishing* Acts of Jurisdiction, even when the *See* was Vacant, though they might, and did manage the Ordinary Discipline of the Church by their Unity and Harmonious Method until another Bishop was chosen. Nor do we contend, but that the College of *Presbyters*
at

at *Rome* might receive *Marcion* into their Communion when the *See* was Vacant, if they proceeded Canonically, and upon evident signs of true Repentance and Contrition. I hope from hence no Man will conclude, that they would have Enterpris'd any thing of this Nature and Consequence if their Bishop was alive, or if another had been chosen in his room.

As for the Testimony cited from *Justin Martyr*, it is obvious to all who know the design of his Apology to *Antoninus*, that he intended no more than to give the *Emperor* a true Account of what was Ordinarily performed in the Christian Meetings, in Opposition to the Scandalous and Abominable Stories that were daily Propagated against them by their Enemies; so that when *Justin Martyr* pleads for the Innocence of the Christian Assemblies, he had no occasion to reckon up the several Gradations of the Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*, being only then concern'd to vindicate their Meetings from the Pagan Libells. He gave the *Emperor* an Account of the Purity of their Worship, that *they* could not at all be charg'd with Sedition, Faction, or those other Impieties, as were ordinarily talked against them.

Besides

Besides all this, it is very well known why the first Christians were to publish any thing relating either to the My-
 steries of their Religion, or the Consti-
 tution of the Church, more than was
 absolutely Necessary in their own De-
 fence against the Reproaches of the
 Heathens; so that there can be nothing
 concluded from *Justin Martyr's* mention-
 ing only the two Orders of the Clergy in
 that Paragraph, insisted on by our Adver-
 saries, but this; that then he had no Oc-
 casion to inform the Heathens how the
 Christian Priests were distinguish'd one
 from another, with regard to their Au-
 thority and Jurisdiction; but whoever
 of them did Officiate in the Publick
 Meetings, their Behaviour was Innocent
 and Holy, and most opposite to what
 was represented against them by their
 wicked Accusers: and it is very hard to
 imagine a Man, that whenever he men-
 tions a Priest, he should give a particu-
 lar Account what Rank he held in the
 Church; whether he was a *Bishop* or a
 subordinate *Presbyter*. And the Objec-
 tion from the Authority of *Justin Mar-*
tir is so much the more Groundless and
 ridiculous, that as the *Offices*, so the
 Names of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were not
 known to be distinguish'd in his
 days

Hist. August.
Script. in vita
Hadriani.

days amongst the Christians, but even the *Heathens* themselves knew so much of their Constitution. Thus the *Roman Emperor* in his *Epistle* to *Servianus* the *Consul*, when he charges the Christian with *Magick*, *Divination*, and *Judicial Astrology*, *illi qui Serapin colunt, Christiani sunt: & devoti sunt Serapi, qui Christi Episcopus dicunt. Nemo illic Archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samaritanus, nemo Christianorum Presbyter, non Mathematicus, non aruspex, non aliptes.*

V. tustifs. s.
Ignat. acta a-
pud Uffer.

It is altogether Nauseous to repeat any more. This silly Quibble founded upon such Dichotomies of the Clergy as now and then occur amongst some Ancient Writers, for the *Names* as well as the *Offices* were distinguished in the earliest Monuments of the Church, as you may see in the *Acts* of *S. Ignatius* his Martyrdom. *Honorabant enim Sanctum per Episcopos Presbyteros & Diaconos Asiae Civitates & Ecclesia.* And *Clemens Alexandrianus*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*, reckon the three Orders plainly, and without any Confusion of *Names*, when they would Distinguish one Priest from another.

It is needless to mention here, what our Adversaries alledge from *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, who was the Com

tion of S. Polycarp, who wrote all his Treatises from the Accounts that he had from older Men that were before him, whether *Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, or Lay-men*, many of whom were Eye-witnesses of our Saviour; but because they were once named *πρεσβυτεροι*, with regard to their Age, not their Office, they immediately conclude them to have been all Presbyterians, acting in a perfect Equality amongst themselves. For, *Papianus* does not consider their Ecclesiastical Character and Subordination, but only tells us, that those from whom he had his Intelligence were Ancient Men, who had Convers'd with the First, and Immediate Apostles of our Saviour.

*Apud Euseb.
Lib. 3. Cap. 39*

The Power of Prejudice is unconquerable. How Miserable is their Condition, who make it their Business to read the Ancients with no other Design than to Distort their Words from their true Meaning and Original Intention. If Men had not sold themselves Unhappily to serve the Interests of Little Parties, how could they shut their Eyes against the Express Testimonies of those Fathers, whose broken Sentences they undergo so much Torture and Abuse, to support their Novelties, and by Wretched Consequences force them to say things that they

they neither knew nor ever heard of? And I would gladly desire the Serious and Attentive Reader to make an Estimate of the Presbyterian Candour (as to their Citations from the Ancients) from two Instances that they insist upon.

The first is that of the *Gallican Martyrs*; their Epistle to *Eleutherus* Bishop of *Rome* in which they recommend *Irenaeus*, who was then but Presbyter of the Church of *Lions*: (for *Pothinus* was not yet dead. The Distinction of *Names* and *Offices* is so evident in that Ancient Monument (a great part whereof is so happily Preserv'd by *Eusebius*) that *Blondel* knew not what to do with it. And not only *Eusebius*, but *Jerome* also had the Authentic Letters of the *Martyrs* of *Lions* and of the Church of *Vienne* and *Lyons* to the Churches of *Asia* and *Phrygia*, and from them transcribed the Historical Accounts that they give us of this Affair. *Pothinus* was then in the Episcopal Chair of *Lyons*; and *Irenaeus* is call'd a Presbyter, because then he had no higher Promotion. This Testimony from such unquestionable Monuments, looks them so broad in the Face, that they know not how to be rid of it; and therefore *Blondel* endeavours to darken the Account that *Eusebius* gave by some *Chronologic*.
Nicetie

liceties, as if *Irenæus*, whom the *Martyrs of Lyons* call a Presbyter, was then actually in Possession of the Episcopal Chair. But this contradicts the Accounts we have from *Eusebius* and *Jerome*, who had the genuine and true Epistles then extant: and their Authority who transmitted to us what they copied from the Original Monuments is of greater Value than the perplext Conjectures and Affected Mistakes of one so mightily prepossess'd in Favour of a Party, as *Blondel* was, whose Chronological Objections the Reader may see accurately refuted by the Incomparable Bishop of *Chester*. *Vindiciæ Ignorant.*

The other Testimony that discovers the Impudence of some Men, is that which they cite from *S. Cyprian*, Bishop of *Carthage*, who Asserts the Episcopal Authority above Presbyters upon all Occasions with the greatest Vigour and Evidence. Nor is there any thing that they can name plausibly to this Purpose, save only that wretched Quibble of the *partite* Division of the Clergy, which is so often already expos'd; nor is there any Book extant that makes the Episcopal Authority over Presbyters so Evident and Unquestionable as the Works of *S. Cyprian*: And to cite Particular Testimonies is altogether needless, though it was

Blondel Apolog.
p. 43.

was the constant Resolution of *SCyprian* to Exercise his Episcopal Authority with the Advice of both Clergy and Laity, yet none ever Asserted or Distinguished the Episcopal Honour and Dignity more Solidly and Clearly than he did. And indeed, if the later Schismatics were at the pains to read him, they would never give us any more Trouble about him. I hope this is sufficiently discuss'd before now by another hand, to whom I refer the Vindicator of the Kirk of *Scotland* for Chastisement and Edification.

Thus I have glanced at some of the Principal Objections that are started against the *Hierarchy*, from the Testimonies of the First Ages; but the Plain Truth is, such as we have to do with, do disparage the Ancients, as incompetent Judges, and decline to be try'd by their Writings. But if they are not Witnesses in a Matter of Fact relating to the Government and Polity of the Church, they are nothing at all: and if they have not transmitted to us the Ecclesiastical Practices and Constitutions of the First Ages, we must believe no Histories nor Records.

There are two Testimonies that I have not yet consider'd, that our Adversaries are most confident of, and which upon
all

all Occasions they cite as the undoubted Registers of Presbytery, and therefore I will examine them more narrowly ; and if *they* do not Prove their Ecclesiastical Parity from those, they must despair to find any Shelter for their Novelties amongst the Ancients.

The First they cite with so much Triumph and Ostentation is *S. Jerome*, who (as they say) was the undoubted Patron of Presbytery in its full Extent and Latitude ; therefore *M. Blondel* entitles his Book *de Episcopis & Presbyteris*, his Apology *Pro Sententia Hieronymi*, as if the Presbyterian Doctrine had been certainly espous'd by *S. Jerome*. At this rate his Contemporaries were very much to be blam'd, who plac'd *Aerius* amongst the *Hereticks*, and yet upon all Occasions make Honourable mention of *S. Jerome*, if he taught the same Doctrine for which *Aerius* was Condemn'd as an *Heretic*.

The Testimonies insisted on from the Writings of *S. Jerome*, are these ; First, in his Commentary upon the Epistle to *Titus*, publish'd in the year 387. where he seems to Assert the *Identity* of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, he hath these Words, upon which our Adversaries endeavour to raise the whole Superstructure of their Parity, *Diligenter Apostoli verba attendamus*

An Enquiry into

mus dicentis ut constituas per civitates Presbyteros, sicut ego tibi disposui, qui, qualis Presbyter debeat ordinari in consequentibus differens, hoc ait, si quis est sine crimine, unius Uxoris vir, &c. Postea intulit, oportet enim Episcopum sine crimine esse tanquam Dei dispensatorem; idem est ergo Presbyter qui & Episcopus, & antequam Diaboli instinctu studia in Religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephae, communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesiae gubernabantur. Postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putavit esse, non Christi; in toto orbe decretum est ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiae cura pertineret, & Schismatum semina tollerentur.

And a little after, he endeavours to prove this Identity of Bishop and Presbyter from 1 *Philip. i. Act. 20. 1 Epist. S. Pet.* and the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. The Texts that are ordinarily insisted on to prove the Presbyterian Parity.

Next, he adds the following words *Hac propterea ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse Presbyteros quos & Episcopos Paulatim verò, (ut dissensionum Plantarum evellerentur) ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt se ex Ecclesiae consuetudine ei qui sibi praepositu*

positus fuerit esse subjectos, ita Episcopi no-
verint se magis consuetudine quam dispo-
sitionis dominica veritate Presbyteris esse
maiores, & in commune debere Ecclesiam re-
gere, imitantes Moysen qui cum haberet so-
lus praesse populo Israel, septuaginta eligit
cum quibus populum judicaret.

Again, they cite his Epistle to Ocea-
nus, where he Asserts, that Bishop and
Presbyter are the same in the Apostolical
Writings.

Again, in his Epistle to Evagrius, he
Cites the same Testimonies that are men-
tioned already from his Commentary on
the Epistle to Titus, to prove the Identi-
ty of Bishop and Presbyter in the Aposto-
lical Writings, and then adds the fol-
lowing Words.

Quod autem postea unus electus est qui
materis proponeretur, in Schismatis remedi-
um factum est ne unusquisque ad se trahens
Christi Ecclesiam rumpere, nam & Alex-
andria a Marco Evangelista usque ad He-
raclam & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri
semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gra-
du collocatum Episcopum nominabant quo-
modo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut
Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium re-
perint, & Archidiaconum vocent, quid e-
grii facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus
quod Presbyter non facit? Nec altera Ro-
mana

mane urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis estimanda est: & Gallia, & Britannia, & Africa, & Persis, & Oriens, & India, & omnes Barbara nationes unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas queratur orbis, major est urbe ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Roma, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis ejusdem meriti, ejusdem & sacerdotii, potentia divitiarum, & paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt.

Again, in the same Epistle to Evagrius, Presbyter & Episcopus, aliud Aetatis, aliud dignitatis est nomen, unde & ad Titum & ad Timotheum de Ordinatione Episcopi & Diaconi dicitur, de Presbyteris omnino reticetur, qui in Episcopo & Presbyter continetur, qui provehitur a minori ad majus provehitur, aut igitur ex Presbytero ordinetur Diaconus, aut Presbyter minor Diacono comprobetur in quem crescat ex parvo, aut si ex Diacono ordinatur Presbyter, noverit se lucris minorem sacerdotio esse majorem, & ut sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitae in templo fuerunt hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri atque Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.

From

From these Testimonies of S. *Jerome* thus gathered together, we perceive, *First*, That he thought that before the Contentions broke out in the Apostolical Church of *Corinth*, *Eccl. sic communi Presbyterorum consilio gubernabantur*; though in this Period, the Apostles govern'd the Churches they had Planted by their Personal and Apostolical Authority, until they had appointed others amongst them, upon whom they devolved the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. *Secondly*, This is evident, that as S. *Jerome* thought that the Superintendence of Bishops above Presbyters was occasion'd by the Contentions that arose among the *Corinthians*; so he thought that this Remedy of Schism (*viz.* the Promotion of one above many) was appointed by the Apostles themselves, and that it was not the Invention of After-Ages. S. *Jerome* never thought that there was a Period of the Church, in which after the Apostles were remov'd, the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction was lodg'd in a College of Presbyters acting within their several Precincts by equal Suffrages; but he affirmed, that though once the Apostolical Churches were govern'd by a Parity of Presbyters, (such was his Mistake) yet that the Apostles themselves immediately, by their own Experience

found the inconvenience of this equality, and therefore appointed *ut unus prapone-retur ceteris.*

The state of the Controversie then between us and the Presbyterians as to the Doctrine of S. *Jerome* is this, whether he thought, or ever wrote that for some Years after the Apostles had left the World, the Government of Christian Churches was lodg'd in the Colledge of Presbyters; or whether he plainly affirm'd, that thô the Ecclesiastical Affairs were manag'd in the beginning of the Apostolical Plantations, *Communi Presbyterorum consilio*, yet this Polity was afterwards chang'd by the Apostles themselves, and the Episcopal Presidency and Jurisdiction of one over many Presbyters, was establish'd by the Apostolical Authority: So the Conjecture of S. *Jerome* is nothing of kin to the error of the Presbyterians.

Blondel saw that this was truly the Doctrine of S. *Jerome*, and consequently his Voluminous Apology is rather the defence of his own Opinions, than those of any of the Ancients; therefore he enters his caution, that none should think that the Apostles themselves appointed the Remedy of Schism, mentioned by him, which he does not allow to have prevail'd in the Church, before the Year 140. But this is

is it that I intend to prove from the writings of *S. Jerome*, that he thought that Episcopacy as Practis'd and Understood in his own Days, was appointed by Apostolical Authority, and therefore the Doctrine of *S. Jerome* is not fairly and ingenuously represented by *Blondel* and *Salmasius*. This appears,

First, from the occasion of the Change that was introduc'd in the Ecclesiastical Government, according to the Opinion of *S. Jerome*: The Reason why the Ecclesiastical Parity was abolish'd, and Prelacy introduc'd, were those Disputes in the Church of *Corinth*, and therefore the change made, must needs be by Apostolical Authority, and not by the determination of later Ages. They only had Power to erect the Ecclesiastical Fabrick upon the best Foundations; and they were much more careful and zealous to prevent the Confusions and Disasters that might befall the Church by Schisms and Divisions, than their Successors. This is it that *S. Jerome* plainly drives at, when he tells us in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, that when such Factions and Divisions arose in the Church, *toto orbe decretum est ut unus &c.*

I desire to know whether any Decree could oblige the whole Catholic Church but that which was in its Nature and Ori-

ginal of Divine and Apostolical Authority: Who could impose Laws upon the Christian Church, dispersed in all Countries but such as were invested with Power from above, *to go and Teach all Nations*? There was no general Council celebrated in the Christian Church before the first Council of *Nice*; no Meeting that could pretend to give Laws to all Christians; and it is hard to say that all Churches would have cheerfully submitted in this case, even to the *Decisions* of an Oecumenic Synod, and therefore the Phrase in *S. Jerome* *Toto orbe decretum*, cannot be refer'd to any thing that is later than an Apostolical Tradition; no other *Decree* would have been universally receiv'd, none else could oblige all the Churches; so *S. Jerome* affirms, that when the Apostles themselves perceived the Disease, they applyed a proper Remedy, for they only could do it with Success and Authority: Which Apostolical Constitution in his Commentaries on the Epistle to *Titus*, he calls *consuetudo Ecclesie*, which he distinguishes from the *Dispositionis dominicæ veritas*, meaning that the Prelacy of one Priest above many, was introduced rather by Apostolical Practice, than the Personal *Mandate* of our *Bl. ssed Saviour*.

Secondly,

Secondly, let us consider S. Jerome's account of the Constitutions of the particular Church of *Alexandria*, that a *Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam & Diocysium, &c.* The custom was even from the Days of S. Mark the Evangelist, that a Presbyter was chosen who Govern'd the whole Society. This, in the Opinion of S. Jerome, cuts off that imaginary interval, wherein the Church is said to have been Govern'd by a Parity of Presbyters. *Salmasius* was aware of this, and therefore here he leaves S. Jerome; for if the Hierarchy was preserv'd in the Church of *Alexandria* from the Days of S. Mark, then the pretended Period of Parity vanishes, the Chasma is closed up, and the three Orders of *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon*, are trac'd to their Apostolical Original. And when *Salmasius* cites this Testimony from S. Jerome, he adds these words; *Quod autem a Marci usque temporibus hunc* Walo Nest. p. *morem Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ repetit, vereor* 205. *ut verum sit*, that is to say, whatever he, or his Associates might pretend, they were resolved to defend other Opinions very different from the Doctrine propagated by S. Jerome, who, tho he was in an error, yet his mistake was *toto celo*, remov'd from the Heresies of *Aerius*, and the Dreams of later Ages.

We

We needed not to have insisted upon this, if our Adversaries had read with Attention the conclusion of his famous Epistle to *Evagrius*, *Et ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento, quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt hoc sibi episcopi Presbyteri atque diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia*, where two things are asserted. *First* that the *Hierarchy* of the Christian Church is founded upon Apostolical Tradition. *Secondly*, that the Apostles had the mode of the Temple in their view, when they erected this Platform and Polity in the Church, which is evident from many other Observations that may be made from the Original Plantations of Christianity; for the Bishop was the same in the Church, as the High Priest was in the Temple, and our Saviour introduc'd no change but such as necessarily did result from the Nature of the Evangelical Oeconomy, which he was to establish in the room of the Levitical Worship, and therefore you find the most ancient Writer reason so often from Jewish Precedent to regulate the Practice of the Christians as *Clemens Romanus*, and *Barnabas*.

Let us consider that *S. Jerom* in his *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, cites the Genuine Epistles of *S. Ignatius*, in which
 Epistle

Epistles the Divine Original and Institution of Episcopal Eminence and Jurisdiction, above Presbyters is frequently and plainly express'd. And thô *Dalleus* asserts that the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* are supposititious; yet he grants, that those which we have now from the *Medicean* Library, were the very same Epistles which *Eusebius* and *Jerome* took to be the Genuin Epistles of S. *Ignatius*, and therefore whatever might be the Opinion of *S. Jerom*, as to the first Original of Episcopal Eminence and Authority; yet when we find him citing the Epistles of S. *Ignatius*, as the genuine Works of that Holy Martyr, it must be acknowledged, that we never dream'd of any interval after the Apostles, wherein the Church was govern'd by a Parity of *Presbyters*. The words of *Jerom* in the forementioned Book, are these, *Ignatius Antiochena Ecclesie tertius post Petrum Apostolum Episcopus, commovente persecutionem Trajano, damnatus ad Bestias, Romam vincetus mittitur, cumque navigans Smyrnam venisset, ubi Polycarpus auditor Johannis Episcopus erat, scripsit unam Epistolam ad Ephesios, alteram ad Magnesianos, tertiam ad Trallenses, quartam ad Romanos, & inde egrediens scripsit ad Philippeos & ad Smyrneos, & proprie ad Polycarpum, commendans illi Antiochenam Ecclesiam.* Now

*Ad Evagrium
quod autem
Postea unus cle-
ricus est, &c.*

Now we have *S. Jerom* affirming that the *Hierarchy* of the Christian Church was founded upon Apostolical Tradition, and deriv'd from the Jewish Model, and that the Church of *Alexandria* had this Polity of *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon* in it, from the Days of *S. Mark* the Evangelist. I would gladly know what Patronage the Presbyterians may expect from *S. Jerom*, if these things be true; therefore I conclude that the word *Postea* in the Language of *S. Jerom*, must not be extended to signify the Term of Fourty Years later than the Apostles, (as *Blondel* would have it,) and which *S. Jerom* never thought of, but only this, that the Apostles, upon the Divisions that broke forth at *Corinth*, immediatly perceived the Inconvenience of Parity, and therefore appointed the subordination of Presbyters within their several *Districts*, to one Bishop, without whose Authority, nothing of any moment was to be attempted in the Government of the Church, no more than the subordinate Priests under the Law, were to enterprize any thing of publick Consequence, without the Authority and interposal of *Aaron* and his Successors.

And with what Modesty may any one deny this to have been the genuin Opinion of *S. Jerom*, when we find him in his

Com

Commentaries on the 23 of *S. Math. Gofpel*, writing exprefly, *Quod fecerunt & Apostoli, per singulas Provincias Presbyteros & Epifcopos ordinantes?* And that his Constitution followed immediatly (in his Opinion) upon the Confufions and Schifms that arofe in the Apostolical Churches, is evident from his Words in his Commentaries on the Epiftle to *Titus*; *Postquam verounusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putavit esse nonChristi, in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus, &c.* In which words, the Remedy againft thofe Confufions, (in the Opinion of *S. Jerome*) was no longer delay'd, than the Difafe appear'd. Its certain that *S. Jerome* was in an errour when he thought that at any time the Church was Govern'd by a Parity of Presbyters, for no fuch thing can be affirmed of the Apostolical Age. The Apofiles themfelves in Perfon Govern'd the Churches that they Planted and committed to fingle Perfons the Infpection of them, when the public Necessities oblig'd them to remove to other places; and the fame Authority was committed to others their Succelfors, until the end of the World. But when we view *S. Jerom* on all quarters, we find nothing in his Sentiments that can be stretch'd to favour the Presbyterian *Hypothesis*; for he deriv'd
the

the Succession of Bishop from the Apostles, and knew no Interval of Parity after they left the World.

Hitherto I have endeavoured by fair and immediate consequence to prove from the Writings of S. Jerom, that he never thought of any such interval, after the Death of the Apostles, in which Ecclesiastical Affairs were transacted, *communis Presbyterorum consilio*. I now go forward to prove that he expresseth no less himself plainly and in so many Words; and here I might transcribe a great part of his Book entituled, *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, where such and such eminent Lights of the Church, are said to have been ordain'd Bishops of such Sees, immediatly by the Apostles themselves. Thus S. James, *qui appellatur frater Domini cognomento Justus*, is said to be *ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus*; and Timothy ordain'd Bishop of Ephesus by S. Paul, and S. Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna, by S. John. Again, in his second Epistle to Nepotianus, *esto Subjectus Pontifici tuo, & quasi anima Parentem suscipe, quod Aaron & filios ejus hoc Episcopum & Presbyteros esse noverimus*. And in his 54 Epistle he distinguishes the Montanists from the Catholics in this, that amongst the Montanists, a Bishop held only

only the Third room ; *apud eos Episcopus certius est.* but that amongst the Catholics, *apud nos Apostolorum locum Episcopi tenent,* and in his Commentaries on the first of *Titus, Apostolus Ecclesie principem formans.* So he understood that the Directions given to *Titus* in that Epistle, were design'd by *S. Paul,* to form an Ecclesiastical Prince or Governor. Again, in his 13th Epistle to *Paulinus, Episcopi & Presbyteri habeant in exemplum Apostolos & Apostolicos viros, quorum honorem possidentes habere nitantur & meritum.*

Vid plura apud Hammond. dissertat. 2. adversus, Blondel.

From all these Testimonies we plainly see how disingenuously our Adversaries represent the Opinion of *S. Jerom,* who never affirmed any Identity between *Bishop* and *Presbyter,* but what was purely nominal, since he reserv'd peculiar Acts of Jurisdiction, to the Episcopal Order, (especially *Ordination,* which Power was never allow'd to any subordinate *Presbyter.*)

Now if this be the Doctrine of *S. Jerom,* that Bishops hold the room of the Apostles, that in the Catholic Church they are in Possession of the Apostolical Honour, that from the beginning, their Authority over particular Churches was established by the Apostles, that it is impossible to prevent endless Confusions and Schisms,

In Dial. Ad-
vers. Lucifer.

Schisms, unless there be granted to the Bishop *exors quaedam & ab omnibus eminentis potestas*, that in the framing this Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*, they had an Eye to the Jewish Polity of the Temple, that the Bishops *presiding* over *Presbyters* in their several Divisions, are the Sons or Heirs or Successors of the Apostolical Dignity. Pray? What can be more said for the Episcopal Power, maintain'd and preserv'd in the Catholic Church, than what hath been asserted by *S. Jerom.*

Now it is certain, that in the Opinion of the *Presbyterians*, none ever affirm'd their Parity so clearly as *S. Jerome*; and therefore he is nam'd in the Front amongst all their *Partizans*, as if their New Doctrine had been plainly deliver'd by him. From this single Instance one may see their Method of Treating the Fathers, whom they force into their Service, contrary to their Original meaning and intention.

I have insisted the longer upon this Authority, that the Reader may see how unsuccessfully they are like to manage this Controversie, if they appeal to the Ancients.

But *St. Jerome* is not the only Man they abuse: *St. Austin* must come in for his share. *Blondel* and *Salmasius* raise a

grea

great deal of Dust to make People believe that they have some Footing for their New *Hypothesis* in his Writings; and not only they, but all the little Buffoons of their Party take it for granted, that the great Bishop of *Hippo* was a Presbyterian. His Name is so much the more Considerable, that he was the Celebrated Doctor of the Church against the *Pelagians* and *Donatists*. And if they can Prove that he was of their Opinion, we are like to hear of it with all possible Ostentation; but as Ill Luck would have it there was no Presbyterian in that Age except *Aerius*. All that the Patrons for Parity contended for in the beginning was no more than to write Apologies for their New Model, as a thing that might be tolerated with regard to the Difficult and Uneasie situation of their Affairs in some Reform'd Churches.

But amongst us the Humour fermented much Higher, and the Opposition to the Ancient Government was so Violent, that the New Scheme of Parity must need; be Asserted to derive its Original from *Express, Positive, and Divine* Authority. There is hardly any thing more Astonishing, than to see so many Books written upon such a Controversie. If we believe the Ecclesiastical Records,

G

there

there remains no Debate but that the Universal Church has deriv'd this *Hierarchy* of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, from the Apostles. If we do not believe those ancient Monuments, I am afraid our *Scepticism* may (even by Natural Consequence) pull down things more Sacred than the outward Hedge of Government. Matter of *Fact* cannot be convey'd to Posterity but by *Testimony*: and if the Universal Church deliver this Discipline, as a thing not introduc'd by Councils (either Provincial or Oecumenic) but rather as a thing receiv'd without Interruption, from the first Plantations of Christianity; How Impious must it be to change this Apostolical Order, for the later Dreams of Unmortified and Factious Men, who have nothing more in their View than to gratifie their Revenge and other Passions. To resist the Universal Consent of the Church, in a Matter of *Fact*, is the highest step of Impudence and Irreligion. The Roman Orator tells us, that *Omni in re consensus omnium vox naturæ est*. So by Proportion the Uniform Consent of all the Ancient Churches is *Vox Evangelii*.

Tuscul. quest.

But to return from this Digression, *Blondel* and *Salmassius* cites a Sentence or two from *S. Austin*, which they endeavour

your

vour to wrest from its true and Original meaning, as if that Eminent Father had said, that the Authority and Jurisdiction of a Bishop above a Presbyter, was introduc'd by some *Canonical Constitutions* later than Apostolical Practice.

That I may remove this Objection, I will in the first place set down the Testimony alledg'd from *S. Austin* in favour of Ecclesiastical Parity. Secondly, I will let you see that the later *Sectaries* mistake the Meaning of *S. Austin*, and the Phrase upon which they found this trifling Objection. Thirdly, I shall expressly Prove from the very same *S. Austin*, that he thought the Succession of Bishops governing Ecclesiastical Affairs within their own Districts continued in the Church from the days of the Apostles, and therefore he never dream'd of any such Period, in which Ecclesiastical Affairs were govern'd by a Parity of Presbyters.

As to the first of these, the Testimony cited from *S. Austin* by *Salmasius* is to be found in his 19th Epistle addressed to *S. Jerome*, the occasion of it was this. *S. Edit. Basil*

Austin invited *S. Jerome* to all possible Freedom in their Epistolary Conversation, to the end that the Difficulties that might occur to either, in reading the Holy Scriptures, might be fairly propos'd,

without either Ceremonial distance or reserve: And therefore S. *Jerome* is encourag'd to take no Notice (in a manner) of S. *Austin* his Character as a Bishop, but that he might accost him with all possible Easiness and Freedom, that so they (both of them) might with the greater success assist one another, and Edifie the Christian Church by their Explications of the dark Places of Scripture: Therefore S. *Austin* hath these Words, *Atque identidem rogo ut me fidenter corrigas, ubi mihi hoc opus esse perspexeris; quanquam enim secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit, tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hironymo minor est; licet etiam a minore quolibet non sit refugienda vel dedignanda correctio.*

Epist. 19.

From this Fatherly Condescension they must needs conclude St. *Austin* to be a Presbyterian; because he was Civil and Mannerly, he must therefore be Degraded from his Episcopal Dignity: for he intended no more but that, th^o *Episcopacy* was higher than the *Presbyterate*, by the constant Practise of the Universal Church; yet St. *Jerome* was preferable to St. *Austin* by the accomplishments that he acquir'd. That this may more fully appear to be his Meaning, let us consider

der secondly, that our Adversaries think their Modern Notions were signified by such Words as they meet with in the Ancients, when they do not take heed that the Ancient apply'd those words to signifie things very different from what the later Ages have invented. For St. *Austin* meant no other thing by *Usus Ecclesie* than the *Universal Practice* of the Christian Church from the beginning; and this Notion is very familiar to him, *viz.* That *Catholic* and *Universal* Customs had their Rise from Apostolical Authority.

He indeed some where complain'd that there were many Usages crept into the Church in his own days, both Burthen-some and Uneasie; but such Ceremonies were not Introduc'd by the *Early* and *Universal* Practice of the Church; they knew for the most part their Original, and the particular Occasions of their Institution, the Authority of such a *Pope*, or the Canon of such a *Council*; and therefore S. *Austin* thought it not Convenient that the Church should be Over-charged with such Ritual Observances, as might divert the Piety and Attention of the People. But for such Customs and Constitutions as were receiv'd Universally in all Churches, from the very first Preaching

of the Gospel, those he always consider'd as Sacred and Inviolable, and that they were deriv'd from Apostolical Authority: for nothing could oblige the Universal Church, when it was dispers'd in the Dominions of many Princes, (whose Interests and Pretences were frequently opposite to one another) but some Original Cause of Universal Influence; so that S. *Austin*, by this Complement, intended no more than that *now* under the Evangelical Oeconomy, by the Constant and Early Practice of the Church, from the Days of the Apostles, the Character and Dignity of a Bishop was above *that* of a Presbyter; yet he freely yielded that S. *Jerome* had many Personal Advantages, with regard to his Piety, Age, and Learning: and thô S. *Austin* complain'd of the number of some later Rites and Ceremonies in his own days, yet no man asserted the *Authority* of Universal Tradition and Apostolical Discipline, with greater vigour than S. *Austin* did; and we do not so much lean on his Authority in this Particular, (thô we highly honour his Memory) as on his Solid and Unanswerable Reasonings; For thus he Argues, that what was confirm'd by Universal Custom in the Christian Church, could have no beginning later

later than the Apostles, *quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper verentum, non nisi Autoritate Apostolica traditum rectissime credimus.*

The Churches of Christ had Customs in the Days of the Apostles, that were universally observ'd, (the Power of Rituals being always lodg'd in the Church) and if *S. Austin* thought that the usages and Practice of the Universal Church, which were not introduc'd by Councils, (yet still retain'd) were of Apostolical Authority, what hurt has he done to the Episcopal Power, when he tells us, that it was founded on *usus Ecclesie*, which in his Language signifies nothing else than that universal Practice of the Christian Church, which obtain'd in all Ages, and in all Places, and therefore must needs spring from no lower Original than Apostolical Authority. Let our Adversaries tell us plainly by what *Council*, either *Provincial* or *Oecomenic*; was Episcopacy introduc'd, and if they cannot trace it to any later Original than that I have nam'd; why do they dream that it may be imputed to any other Constitution than that which is purely Divine. *If any Man be contentious, we have no such Custom, nor the Churches of Christ.*

But to convince you further how much S. *Austin* distinguish'd the Customs of the Universal Church, from such Rites and Ceremonies as prevail'd only in particular places; you may Read his 118 Epistle to *Januarius*, where he determines plainly that we are to comply with the Ceremonies of particular Churches, in all innocent and indifferent Customs; *totum hoc genus rerum liberam habet observationem, nec disciplina ulla est in his melior gravi prudentique Christiano, quam ut eo modo agat quo agere viderit Ecclesiam, ad quamcunque forte devenerit.* But for other things that were decided by the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, or, *Consuetudine universæ Ecclesiæ roborata*; these last he thought immutable, as deriving their Obligation from a higher cause, than the Discipline and Constitution of particular Churches. In vain then do the Patrons of *Parity* distort S. *Austin's* Complement to S. *Jerom*, as if he acknowledg'd that ever the Church was Govern'd by Ecclesiastical Officers, acting in perfect Equality; for S. *Austin* meant no other thing by *usus Ecclesiæ*, than an universal and Original Practice, deriv'd from the Apostles; such Customs, in his own Language, *quæ consuetudine Ecclesiæ universæ roborata sunt*, which he plainly distinguishes from that
other

other train of lesser observances, in particular Churches, for which there is no other Rule than the Custom of that place where you live.

Thirdly, let us enquire more particularly into *S. Austin's* Opinion concerning Episcopacy, whether he does not positively assert, that the Succession of Bishops one after another, in the *See of Rome*, did not begin at *S. Peter* himself; and he Reasons thus against the *Donatists*, to prove their *Error* from their *Novelty*. How easily might the *Donatists* return upon him, and tell him, that there was a *Period* in the Christian Church, after the Days of the Apostles, in which the Church was Govern'd without Bishops, by a Parity of Ecclesiastical Officers? And to his Argument to prove the *Donatists* erroneous, from the Succession of Bishops, (amongst whom there was no *Donatist*) downwards from *S. Peter*, to his own Days; was in it self but weak and precarious; because they might reply, that indeed there was no such uninterrupted Succession at all. The Testimony at length is to be found in the 165 Epistle: *Edit. Basl.*
*Si enim ordo Episcoporum sibi succedentium
considerandus est, quanto certius, & vere
salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus, cui to-
tius Ecclesie figuram gerenti Dominus ait,
super*

super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, & portæ inferorum non vincent eam. Petro enim successit Linus, Lino Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, Anacleto Evaristus, and this Succession of one in the room of another he carries down from S. Peter to Anastasius, who then was Bishop of Rome, and so concludes with these Words, in hoc ordine Successionis nullus Donatista Episcopus invenitur.

If this was a good Argument in the Opinion of S. Austin, then it is evident that he never thought of any Constitutions later than the Apostles, by which the Authority of a Bishop above a Presbyter was established. S. Peter was the first Bishop of the Roman Church in his Opinion, and Linus succeeded S. Peter; and thus Ecclesiastical Affairs were manag'd by a Succession of Bishops from the Days of the Apostles. From all which we may reasonably infer, that by *usus Ecclesiæ*, in the Language of S. Austin, there was no more intended than the practice of the Primitive and Universal Church, from the Days of S. Peter, to the time of Anastasius, who then sat in the Episcopal Chair of Rome.

Add to all this, that in his Catalogue of Heresies, *ad quod-vult-Deum*, he reckons Aeri-
Aerius as one of the Hereticks, *Aeriani*
 ab

*Aerio quodam sunt nominati, qui cum
 et Presbyter doluisse fertur, quod Episco-
 ps non potuit ordinari, (this was exactly
 the case of Mr. Andrew Melvil in Scot-
 land;) and when S. Austin reckons up
 some Opinions that were then thought
 heretical, he adds as one of the peculiar
 doctrines of *Aerius, dicebat Presbyterum
 Episcopo nulla differentiâ debere discer-**

From these places we may see how far
Austin was a Presbyterian. The truth
 our Adversaries might be so modest as
 leave us in the possession of the *Coun-
 sels* and *Fathers*; since they have the Ec-
 clesiastical Revenues at their own dispo-
 sition. In the purest times of the Church,
 the Christians reason'd against the Here-
 ticks from the Succession of their *Catholic
 Bishops*, who liv'd and died in the true
 and Orthodox Faith. If this was not a
 good Argument, might not the *Heretics*
 answer, that there was no such Succession
 of Bishops succeeding one another, from
 the Days of the Apostles; but that the
 Order of Bishops was the Result of later
 Determinations and Synodical Constitu-
 tions. But we hear of no such answer
 turn'd, because indeed there was no
 room left for it. The first *Heresiarchs*
 could not have fail'd to expose an Argu-
 ment

ment, which was not supported by the truth of History, if the Testimony of the Universal Church, and the unanimous suffrages of Catholick Antiquity had not guarded it against all exception and contradiction.

Thus far I have view'd the two most considerable Objections in favour of the Presbyterian equality : Few of our Adversaries (I mean in our own Country) Read any of the *Ancients* ; and when they would set off their New Doctrine with some shew of Learning, they consult *Blondel* and *Salmasius*, and for the most part they go no farther than *Smectimnua*. It is enough for their purpose that there are some Sentences in the Writings of the *Fathers*, which may be plausibly forc'd to admit of New significations. It is the incurable Peevishness of some, that they think the design of any Author, may be fully understood by broken Sentences, torn from their Neighbour places, when they have neither the Patience, nor good Nature to hear and consider what is delivered by the same Author, in other Paragraphs of his Works. There is so much Justice due to all Men, that they ought to be heard in their own cause ; for they are the best Interpreters of their own Words : If this had been duly weigh'd

ur bawling People would never have cited S. *Austin* for their imaginary *Parity*. The Catholic Church had no Presbyterian Bishops in the Days of S. *Austin*, nor did he himself ever think, that his Comlement bestowed upon S. *Jerom*, would have been made use of in after Ages, to bett confusion and equality; for he ever dream'd of any interval, after the Days of the Apostles, in which the Christian Church was govern'd by the *Gene-a Model*, else he had not pleaded the Succession of Catholick Bishops against the *Donatists*.

I have nam'd but a few of the Testimonies of the Ancients, which they abuse, not knowing as yet whither their *Genius* will determine them. And since they maintain Practices now, which we never heard of before; it is but reasonable to expect that they may defend their Innovations by Arguments that we have not been formerly acquainted with. I only desire the Reader to take Notice, that their Opinion of Presbyterian Parity, by Divine Right, is not only New, but absurd, and supported by Dreams and visionary Consequences. So unsafe it is to advance New Doctrines, that contradict the common Sense of Mankind, as well

as the universal and uninterrupted Testimony of all Christian Antiquity.

C H A P. II.

Of the Succession of Bishops, from the Apostles.

Hitherto I have examin'd some of the most plausible pretences for Presbyterian Parity. Such as design no more than Confusion and clamour, endeavour to darken the true State of the Controversie; and therefore it is necessary to remove the Ambiguity by which they have obscur'd it.

First, it is granted on both Hands, that the Government of the Christian Church hath been established by our Saviour and his Apostle, and that *this* Government so fix'd, is of that importance to true Religion, that it ought not to be chang'd or destroy'd, until the end of the World; that they who wilfully oppose the Original institution of our Saviour and his Apostles, are *Schismatics*, in the strictest Sense, from Catholick Unity and Order.

Secondly,

Secondly, it is agreed, that there was a *Hierarchy* under the Old Testament, and that the *High Priest* had a superiority and Jurisdiction over all subordinate Priests in the Jewish Oeconomy; whence this conclusion is necessary, that the subordination of one Priest unto another, is not in it self *Simpliciter* unlawful.

So much being premis'd as Common Principles, before I propose the State of the Controversie, let me be allow'd to Enquire into the Nature of the Apostolical Office; in which we must Distinguish between the *Ordinary, Permanent, Essential* Power of the Apostles, and the *Extrinsic* and *Extraordinary* Privileges and Advantages of that Power, such as were suitable to the first Plantations of Christianity. By the *first* they were Distinguish'd from all Subordinate Ecclesiastical Officers in the Christian Church. By the *Second*, they were put in a capacity to Exercise their Authority with the greater Success in the Conversion of Infidels, and Government of those that were already Converted.

We ought (with the greater care) to distinguish between the *Essential Apostolical* Office, and the *Extraordinary* Prerogatives that adorn'd the first Apostles, in that the *One* was *Transient, Temporary*

ry, and *Limited* to the Exigencies of the first Christian Mission. The other is *Necessary, Permanent*, and perpetual in the Christian Church, *Matth. 28. Behold I am with you even to the end of the world.*

That this may appear more clearly let us consider, that the Apostles as *such* were *Formally* and *Essentially* distinguish'd from all other Ecclesiastical Officers of any Subordinate Station or Dignity. Now it may be Reasonable to Enquire what *it* was that distinguish'd an *Apostle* from the 72 Disciples, from Presbyters in the Modern Notion, or from Deacons in the Apostolical Church, or the other Officers that are nam'd in the Scriptures. The *Presbyterians* and *Socinians* * (contrary to the Uniform Testimony of Antiquity) affirm, That the Apostolical Office is ceas'd, that it was Extraordinary, that they were Distinguish'd from other Subordinate Ecclesiasticks by their Infallibility in Preaching, by their Power of Miracles, by their being *immediately* call'd by our Saviour to the *Apostolate*, by their unlimited and unconfi'd Commission to Propagate the Gospel amongst all Nations. In Opposition to which, we affirm, That the *True, Characteristic, Formal* and *Distinguishing* mark of an *Apostle*, was, his *Constant, Supream, Spiritual,*

* *Catechism.*
Racov. Sect. 9.
Cap. 2. quod
attinet ad Apo-
stolos —
Certum est eos
amplius in Ec-
clesia Christi
non inveniri.

ritual, and *Perpetual* Power, Authority, and Jurisdiction over all Subordinate Officers, and all others believing in Christ, and his Power to transmit this Authority unto his Successors, according to the Commandment of our Saviour.

The *Permanent* and *Successive* Power of the Apostles was, to Preach the Gospel, to Govern the Churches they had Planted, to give Rules and Directions to their Successors in the same Office, and to all Subordinate Ecclesiasticks, to inflict Censures, to Communicate this Authority to others, to Hear Complaints, to Decide Controversies and settle the Discipline of the Church, to Confer the Holy Ghost, as the Necessities of the Faithful do require in all Ages; (I mean those Gifts of the Holy Ghost that must needs attend the Authoritative Ministry of Holy Things.) Now the Apostolical Office being *Essentially* no other than *this*, it remains for ever in the Church, and the ordinary Necessities of the Church do require that it should continue until the second Coming of our Saviour.

But the Extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Power of Miracles, of Languages, and other Spiritual Furniture were but Temporary and Extrinsic Advantages, only Necessary to the first

H Forming

Forming of the Christian Church, and when its Fabric was Erected, then those Scaffoldings were remov'd.

The *Essence* of the Apostolical Office, as such, did not consist in the forementioned extraordinary Privileges, but rather in that *Rectoral* Power and *Spiritual* Jurisdiction deriv'd to them from our Saviour, and by *them* regularly transmitted to their Successors in all Ages. That *they* were distinguish'd from Subordinate Officers is acknowledg'd, from whence I infer, that this Distinction must consist in something that is so Peculiar to the *Apostolate*, as is Incommunicable to any other Order of Ecclesiastical Officers than such as were honour'd with the Apostolical Character.

They were not distinguish'd from Subordinate Officers by the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost; for many of the *Laitie* amongst the first Christians were endued with *such*: Nor by their Infallibility in Doctrine; for the Evangelists and the 72 Disciples were Infallible. And S. *Luke* tells us in the Preface to his Gospel, that he wrote it from the Testimony of such as were *Eye-Witnesses* and *Underministers* of the Word. And St. *Stephen* the Deacon was a Man full of the Holy Ghost, endued with Wisdom, such as his
 Enemies

Enemies were not able to resist, and with the Power of Miracles, yet not advanc'd to the Apostolical Dignity: Nor is it necessary to make up an *Apostle*, that he be *immediately* call'd to the *Apostolate* by our Saviour; for *Matthias*, who was chosen to fill up the Vacancy that happen'd in the Sacred College by the *Apostacy* of *Judas*, was not *immediately* Ordain'd by our Saviour, but by the Apostles, who had Power to continue that Succession to the end of the World. And tho' it was necessary that the *first* Apostles of the Christian Church should be Witnesses of our Saviours Resurrection, yet the being a Witness of his Resurrection did not make them *Apostles*; else *Matthias* had been an Apostle in the strictest Notion, before he was formally Invested with that Character: any one may see the Absurdity of this; therefore I conclude, that the *Essence* of the Apostolic Office cannot be plac'd in those Extraordinary Privileges that were so Plentifully pour'd on the First Ministers of, or Converts to Christianity. It remains therefore, that the Apostolical Office, in its *Nature* and *Essence*, is perpetual in the Church; for our Saviour promised to be with them unto the end of the World.

An Enquiry into

And as this Ordinary and Perpetual Power was deriv'd from Christ to his Apostles, so by them it was convey'd to their Successors to all succeeding Generations, and then it must be *Jure Divino* in the most rigorous Notion of the Word. Nor is there any thing can formally distinguish an Apostle from other Ministers of the Evangelical Oeconomy, but their *Supream* and *Spiritual* Power to Govern and Manage Ecclesiastical Affairs by their proper Authority, of which they are to give an account to our Saviour.

And as the Office was deriv'd unto others, besides the Twelve, so the Name of an Apostle was not confin'd to that Number, *Philip. 2. 25.* *Epaphroditus* is said to be their Apostle. Its true, our English Version reads it *Epaphroditus your Messenger*: But this is altogether contrary to the Notion of that Word in the New Testament; for an *Apostle* in those Writings never signifies a Messenger sent by Men to Men, as *Beza* renders it, but rather the Messenger of God to Men; and the Vulgar Latin hath translated it right, *Epaphroditum fratrem vestrum autem Apostolum*, who, without all Question, was Bishop of *Philippi* at this time, Taught and Ordain'd by the Apostles; and the Word (*Apostle*) ought

to be thus understood in other places, where they have Inadvertently translated it *Messengers*, 2 Cor. 8. 23. And the English reading of this place, as it runs, is certainly a Mistake; it being no considerable part of the Glory of Christ, that those Apostles were employ'd in *Inferior* Messages from one Church to another, but rather in the Authoritative Mission and Delegation of them, for the ends of a more Heavenly Embassy: in this last Sense they were truly *Apostoli Ecclesiarum*, not sent by the Churches, but to the Churches by Christ, which may be further illustrated from *Rom. 16. 7.* where the Greek Phrase may be justly render'd *inter Primarios Apostolos*. And I may safely affirm, that the word (*Apostle*) never signifies in the New Testament any other than the Messenger of God towards Men. And though the Provinces assign'd by the first Apostles to those *Secondary* Apostles, were more narrow and limited than those they took care of themselves; yet this alters not at all the Nature of their Office and Apostolical Power, which they were to Exercise within their proper Bounds, no more than the King's of *Juda* can be deny'd the Honour of sitting on the Throne of *David* in full Power and Royal Authority after the

V. Treat. of
Church Govern-
ment by R. B.

Apostacy of the ten Tribes; for they were as truly Kings as any of their Royal Predecessors, even *Solomon* himself in all his Glory, though the number of their Subjects were not equal.

When the Apostles Divided the World amongst them, they did not measure their Lots Geometrically, as if the Bounds and Provinces of their Inspection were as exactly Equal as the Spiritual Power it self, with which they were Invested: But some Laboured more, and Travell'd farther than others, yet the Extent of those Provinces and Regions that they Labour'd in, did not at all change or alter the *Rectoral* Power and Jurisdiction with which they were endued; no more did the Apostolical Authority, which was transmitted to their Successors, differ from that which was Originally lodg'd in the first Apostles, though they were confin'd in the Exercise of that Power to narrower Limits, not by the Nature of the Power it self, but by the variable Necessities and Circumstances of the Church; the Rules of Order, and the Multitude of Converts, oblig'd them afterwards more to Personal Residence.

When the Apostles continued for some years at *Jerusalem*, after the Ascension of our Saviour, they divided the (*then*)
known

known World amongst them by Lots, and some went into *Asia*, and some into *Scythia*, some into *Europe*, some as far as the East *Indies*: they did not all of them Travel together into the same Country, but every one went speedily about to Cultivate that Lot which fell to his Share, as is plainly Insinuated, *Act* 1. when *Matthias* is chosen to the *Apostolate*, v. 25. that he might take the Lot of his *Ministry* and *Apostleship*: and when they Founded Churches in their Travels, they retain'd the Government of them in their own Persons for a while; but when the Necessities of the Church did oblige them to remove, they committed the *Episcopal*, or *Apostolical* Inspection of those Churches to particular Persons, who succeeded the *Apostles* themselves even in their *Apostolical* Authority; I mean, that *Rectoral* power, which was *Permanent* and *Perpetual*, and by which the *Apostles* were distinguish'd, not only from the faithful, but from all other Subordinate Ecclesiasticks.

It is true, that as Converts were multiplied, and amongst them several were found qualified to Officiate in the Evangelical Priesthood, in that case, the Laws of Order obliged Bishops and Presbyters not to encroach one upon the other, that

every one might apply himself to feed the Flock of Christ, within those Limits that the Divine Providence allotted to him; yet neither the Apostles, nor their Immediate Successors were so confin'd to particular *Sees*, but that, proportionably to the Exigencies of the Catholic Church, their Episcopal Care and Super-intendance did reach the whole as far as was possible, and as Christian Charity did require or allow, notwithstanding of that more fix'd and nearer relation they might have to particular Churches. And this doth not only appear by their frequent Epistles, address'd to Neighbouring Churches upon all emergent Straits and Difficulties, but also by their Personal Travels, to order such things as were wanting; so that the Practice of the Primitive Bishops resembled that of their Immediate Founders, as it were in *Miniature*, their Features and Lineaments exactly the same. The confinement to a particular *See* or Residence does not proceed from the Nature of the Priesthood, but from Rules of Prudence, Ecclesiastical Oeconomy, and Canonical Constitutions: for the Apostles ordain'd Bishops for the Spiritual Services of such as should afterwards believe, as St. *Clement* witnesses.

*Primis Ecclesie
temporibus om-
nes Episcopi,
præter peculia-
rem curam pro-
pria Ecclesie
insolidam sibi
commissam, ut
loquitur Cypri-
anus, etiam U-
niversam, suo
quodam modo
curabant.
Causaubon ex-
ercitat. 14 ad
Annales Bartni,
numero 4.*

So much being premis'd concerning the Nature of the *Apostolate*, let us next enquire whether this *Rectoral* Power, and Episcopal Jurisdiction, with which the first Apostles were invested, over subordinate Ecclesiasticks, was afterwards committed to, and exercised by particular Persons, succeeding one after another, in the room of the Apostles, in particular Churches; or whether the Apostles did commit their Episcopal Jurisdiction, and Apostolical Authority, which they exercised in particular Churches, to such single Successors, duly and regularly chosen; or to a College of Presbyters, acting in the Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs, in perfect Parity and Equality. This I take to be the genuine State of the Controversie. I made it evident in the first Chapter, that there was such a *confusion of Names* in the Holy Scriptures, that it was not possible to state an Identity or Community of Offices from the common Names frequently attributed to such as were undeniably distinguish'd with regard to their Authority; therefore we must fix this Debate so, as it may be reasonably determin'd, and that we may not fight for ever in the Dark.

*The true state
of the Contro-
versie.*

We have the promise of our blessed Saviour for the perpetual duration of the
Apostolical

Apostolical Office, and this Promise was made to them, not in their Personal, but in their Spiritual Capacity; for Christ loved the Church as much after they were removed from the Earth, as before. If it appears then, that their Episcopal Power was duly convey'd to single Successors, in all particular Churches, and not to a College of Presbyters, acting in a perfect Parity and Equality; then it is clear, that Episcopal Government is for ever established by a Divine right, in the Christian Church.

In a matter of Fact, there can be no decisive proof but Testimony, and the Testimony alledg'd by us, is so much the stronger, that it hath been universally receiv'd; for the Church knew no other Government for 1400 Years, than that which we plead for.

Our next Enquiry must be, whether we find this *Rectoral* Power was transmitted immediatly by the Apostles to single Successors. Let us *First*, view the Holy Scriptures, and then the Ecclesiastical Records.

In the first place we find *Timothy* set over the Church of *Ephesus* by *S. Paul*, when he went into *Macedonia*, Compare *Acts*, 20. 3, 4, 5. ver. and 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. as *I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus,*
where

when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some, that they Teach no other Doctrine. It is not deny'd but that Timothy after he was in a particular manner established Bishop of the Church of Ephesus, might wait upon S. Paul, his spiritual Father, to yield that assistance to him that was due to so eminent an Apostle, and the services of his Religion. But this cannot infer that he was disingg'd upon such occasional Journies, from that Episcopal Authority and Inspection, which was particularly committed to him in the Church of Ephesus by S. Paul.

Timothy was as much a Deacon when he went down to Samaria, as when he serv'd

Acts, 6.

Acts, 8: 5.

the Tables at Jerusalem. Nor is there any amongst the Presbyterians who would take it kindly, if they were told they had lost all Title and Relation to particular Flocks, if upon some occasions they are employ'd now and then to visite the Court or Foreign Churches: and we find that the Ancients took no notice of any such Objection against his being the first and establish'd Bishop of Ephesus; in the Eleventh Act of the Council of Chalcedon, they reckoned 27 Bishops from Timothy to their own Days.

Vid. Hammond. dissert. 4. adversus Blondel.

Now let us view from the Epistles to Timothy, what Power and Authority was committed

committed unto him ; he is commanded not to rebuke an Elder, but to entre him as a Father, *1 Tim. 5. 1.* and again not to receive an accusation against an Elder, but before two or three Witnesses, ver. 19. to rebuke such as Sin before a Church, that others also may fear, to lay Hands suddenly on no Man, ver. 22. to ordain such Deacons as are first proved and found blameless, and the following words, *Tim. 3. 14, 15.* plainly insinuate his particular Relation to the Church of *Ephesus.* *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly, but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and ground of the Truth.* He is likewise commanded *1 Tim. 5. 9.* to take special care of the Widows, and carefully to distinguish such as were true Objects of Charity, from such as might be justly charged with Levity and Wantonness. He is directed in a special manner, *1 Tim. 2. 1.* to order the publick Worship and Liturgies of the Church, and *1 Tim. 21.* he is charged and he alone in the Church of *Ephesus,* before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, that he would observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by Partiality.

In these Apostolical Injunctions, address'd particularly and Personally to *Timothy*, we contain'd the *Nature, Extent* and *Authority* of his Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction, his Relation to the Church of *Ephesus*, and the *Perpetuity* of that Power committed to him in the Church; ^{1 Tim. 6. 13,} which he is commanded to *commit to* ^{2 Tim. 2. 2.} *faithful Men, who should be able to teach others also.* So this Power, which was *Personally* lodg'd in him, was not *Temporary* or *Transient*, but *Successive* and *Perpetual*, and deriv'd unto others *in Solidum*, as he received it *himself*.

It is not then debated between us and our Adversaries, whether the Power exercised by *Timothy* in the Church of *Ephesus*, was not the very same Power that we plead for as due to Bishops, in their particular *Sees*; for they grant, that such Power was exercised by him in the Church of *Ephesus*, but they pretend that he exercised this Power under the Notion of an *Evangelist*, not as proper Bishop of *Ephesus*. This I am to examine afterwards: I desire at present no more to be granted, than that which cannot be denyed, *viz.* 1. That the Power which he exercised, was in it self lawful. 2. That it was practis'd by *Timothy* in the Church of *Ephesus*. 3. That it was committed

to him alone by *S. Paul*; and not to Colledge of Presbyters, acting amongst themselves, in Parity and Equality

4. That there is no mention of any spiritual Power, lodg'd in a Colledge of Presbyters, to which *Timothy* was accountable for his Administrations. 5. That the great and most eminent Branches of the Episcopal Power were lodg'd in his Person, the Ordination of such as were admitted unto the sacred Function, the care of the Widows, the Censuring of Elders, and his Authoritative preventing of Heresies. These are the things about which the Episcopal Authority was most conversant in the Primitive Time

6. That this Authority was not in it self of *Temporary* Duration, transient, or extraordinary; but such as the constant necessities of the Church, do make necessary in all Ages; for he was commanded to commit it unto faithful Men, such should be able to teach others; and there be nothing in it extraordinary, what do they say, that in the discharging of an ordinary Trust, there was need of an extraordinary Officer?

The same Power was committed by *S. Paul* to *Titus*, in the Church of *Cret*; he was one of *S. Pauls* fellow Labourers, as *Timothy* was; and tho' it is ordin

ily said, that this Power was exercised by *Titus*, as he was an Evangelist, yet this is but a ridiculous Subterfuge; for it is no where said in the Scriptures, that he was one of them who were called Evangelists. Besides that, the work of an Evangelist hath nothing in its Nature, opposite to, or inconsistent with the Dignity and Character of either *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*. For an Evangelist in the notion of *Eusebius*, was a Person that ^{37.} Preach'd the Gospel to such as formerly had not heard of it; at least, such as yet had resisted the light of it, and were not converted by it. And is it not very agreeable to the *Character* and Function of either of these Officers, to Preach the Gospel to such as are not yet acquainted with it? It is recommended to *Timothy*, to do the Work of an Evangelist, and there was good Reason for it; for many amongst the *Ephesians* were still Infidels. But it is insinuated no where, that he was only invested with that Authority, that agrees to the Notion of an Evangelist, separated and distinguished from either *Bishop* or *Presbyter*. One may do the Work of an Evangelist, who is much higher than an Evangelist. *Daniel* is said to do the Work of the King, yet *Daniel* was no King. D. m. 8. 27. *Philip* was an Evangelist, *Acts*, 21. 8. but he

he was also one of the seven Deacons mentioned, *Acts 6.* but *Philip* had no Power to confirm such as were baptiz'd, nor to ordain Ecclesiastic Officers by Imposition of Hands, such as *Timothy* had. To be an Evangelist, is very agreeable to all the subordinations of the Christian Hierarchy. Most of all the Primitive Bishops were Evangelists; for by their Preaching, Infidels were converted: and any Bishop or Presbyter that now a Day Converts Jews or Pagans, are as properly Evangelists, as any of them that were so called in the Primitive Church.

Blondel *Apolo-*
log. p. 50. Jaco-
bum Domini
fratrem Hiero-
solymitane
Ecclesie Epif-
copum a Colle-
gis ordinatum
constanter affe-
runt veteres
omnes.

The same Apostolical or Episcopal Authority was committed to *S. James* the Just, in the Church of *Jerusalem*; and whether he was one of the Twelve or not is not material to my design. It is enough that he had the Name and Authority of an Apostle, *Gal. 1. 19. 2. Gal. 9.* That he was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, is uniformly attested by the most ancient Witnesses, particularly *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Hegesippus*. But here it is needless to fill either Text or Margin, with Citations; for all our Adversaries acknowledge, that he was the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, in the *Metropolis* of the Jews: and * *Sa'masius* particularly, that he stirr'd not from *Jerusalem*, tho' the other Apostles were scat-

* *Walo Mess.*

tered and dispersed to plant the Gospel in other Countries. And the Account that the Scripture gives of him is very agreeable to the Testimony of the Ancients.

When *S. Peter* was delivered from his Imprisonment by the Angel, he commands that those things should be made known to *James* and the Brethren, in which words the Deference paid to *S. James* is visible, and taken notice of elsewhere frequently, as *Gal. 1. 19. Gal. 2. 1, 9.* and most of all, *Acts 15. 19.* where he pronounces the sentence of the Council, by his Episcopal Authority; not that he alone decided the Affair in debate, by his sole Power, without the Concurrence of other Apostles, but as Bishop of *Jerusalem*, he presided in that Council. To *James* succeeded *Simeon*, and he liv'd to a great Age; and a little after *Hegesippus* wrote his Commentaries, who gives the succession of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*; nay *Calvin* himself yields all that we plead for in his Commentaries on *Gal. 2. 9.* He tells us that *S. James* was prefer'd to *S. Peter*, because he was *Hierosolymitana Ecclesie prefectus*. I only name these instances from the Scriptures, which plainly demonstrate, that the Apostolical or Episcopal Authority, was convey'd to single Persons in the first Plantations of

Christianity. I do not now insist on those imaginary and superficial exceptions that are invented by our Adversaries.

Rev. 2. 3.

The next I mention are the seven Angels of the seven *Asiatic* Churches. To prevent any Argument that might be founded on this *Apostolical* and undeniable example of single Presidents and Governors, over many Presbyters, in the *Asiatic* Churches, before the Death of S. *John*; *Salmasius* enters only his protestation, (we must not call it an Argument) why those Angels ought not to be understood single Persons or Governors, but that by the Angels are meant the Churches themselves; *quia autem in urbibus tunc temporis ea pars populi purior sanctiorque, atque adeo magis spiritalis censebatur, que Christi fidem acceperat, ideo eam angelo comparavit, & sub Angeli nomine ad eum sermonem direxit. Sit ergo hoc fixum per Angelos Urbium nihil aliud voluisse Johannem designari nisi ipsas Ecclesias.* But this silly subterfuge is far below the Learning and sense of *Salmasius*, since the Angels are expressly distinguish'd from the Churches in the Text itself, 1 *Rev.* 20. the seven Stars are said to be the Angels of the seven Churches, but according to *Salmasius* his interpretation, they must needs be the seven Churches of the seven Churches; and

Walo Mess.
p. 184.

and in the beginning of the second Chapter, the Epistle is Address'd to the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, and not to the Church of the Church of *Ephesus*; where we may plainly see, that as the Stars are distinguish'd from the Candlesticks, so the Angels are distinguish'd from the Churches. Yet it may be easily yielded, that the Heavenly Admonitions first Address'd to those Angels, were also communicated to the Churches, but by the *interposal* of their Angels, who cannot be call'd a *Company*, a *Multitude*, or a *College* of Angels; but one single Angel presiding in their Ecclesiastical Meetings and Affairs, both over the People, and subordinate Presbyters.

Vid. Usher. disert. de Ignat. & Polycarp. Epist. cap. 18.

And tho' there be some Instructions in those Epistles, in which *others*, besides the Angels, are particularly admonished; yet the Epistles are no less Address'd to single Angels, than the Epistle to the *Philippians*, is to the whole Church at *Philippi*, tho' S. Paul uses particular compellations, chap 4. ver. 2. 3. *I intreat thee also, true yoke fellow, help those Women which laboured with me in the Gospel.*

The second Epistle to *Timothy* is Address'd to him alone, tho' the conclusion be to all the faithful at *Ephesus*. The Bishops of the *Asiatic* Churches are said to be Angels in Imitation of the Jews,

amongst whom the High-Priest was dignified with that Name, *Mal*, 2. 7. The word (*Messenger*) may be translated *Angel*; their Authority was not Temporary or confin'd to the Meetings of the Clergy; but extended both to Clergy and Laity, therefore we find that the faults of the Churches are imputed to the Angels, because of their spiritual Power, to reform and Chastise those Abuses.

There is one place more insisted on to prove that those Epistles were directed to Communities, and not to single Persons, and that is the Epistle to *Thyatira*, *Rev*. 2. 24. *but unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira.* Hence they plead as if this Epistle had been directed to a Community, because the compellation is in the Plural, *ver*. 24. But if we consult the most ancient Manuscripts, the word (*xy*) is left out, and then there is no shadow of an Objection; particularly in the *Alexandrian* Manuscript, preserv'd in the Royal Library, that word is wanting, and so the Reading is plain and easie. The Address is not only to the Angel of *Thyatira*, but to the rest *who had not known the depths of Satan*, nor made any defection to the *Gnostic* Heresie.

But if the common Reading be thought more genuine, yet the words insisted on by the Patrons of Ecclesiastical Parity cannot

*Vid. Hammend.
Dissert. 4. ad-
versus Blon-
del. cap. 4.*

cannot be applyed so properly to the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira*, as to those that are mentioned in the latter end of the 23^d ver. And *they* are the other Churches of *Asia*, which, because they are mentioned in the Speech directed to the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira*, the immediate *Transition* from him to them, is natural and easie, and all the Churches shall know, *viz*, the Churches of *Asia* shall know that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts, ver. 24. but unto you *i. e.* the Churches of *Asia*, &c.

Beza himself acknowledges, that those Epistles are not Address'd to a College of Presbyters, but to one *Præses*, whom he makes, in a ridiculous manner, contrary to the sense of all Antiquity, a Weekly, or a Monthly *Moderator*. *Vid. Beza in locum.*

These Instances being premis'd of so many single Persons invested with Episcopal Authority, in the Apostolick Churches; it is in vain to tell us, that the seven Angels are not called Bishops in the Scripture. For Baptism and the Lord's Supper are not called Sacraments in the Writings of the New Testament, yet we think we express the Sense of Scripture, very agreeably, when we call those *Institutions* by that Name. We are Baptiz'd unto the Faith and Worship of the *Trini-*

ty; Yet we believe we add nothing unto the Doctrine revealed in Scripture, when we express a Mystery of our Faith by that word *Trinity*. But when they remember that at this very time, when those Epistles were address'd to the Asiatic Angels, S. *Polycarp* was Bishop of *Smyrna*; This very *Thought* alone spoils all the Présbyterian Gloss; and when we compare the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna*, with the most ancient Acts of S. *Polycarp's* Martyrdom, they give us a better Commentary on that Epistle, than all the later Explications of the Sectaries.

Vid. Acta Martyr. S. Polycarp.

The whole Question may be easily determin'd, if we enquire into these three Particulars, *First*, Whether the Ancients affirm'd, that the Apostolical Power was deriv'd to the Bishops as their Successors? *Secondly*, Whether they Insist frequently on this Succession of single Persons to the Apostles in Particular *Sees*, when they reason against Hereticks? *Thirdly*, Whether we may with Safety and Confidence lean on their Authority and Tradition in an Affair of this Consequence?

I. Whether the Ancients affirm'd that the Apostolical Power was deriv'd to the Bishops as their Successors? That they did is Evident from the early Catalogue

logue of Bishops, succeeding one another in the Apostolical Sees, by the most ancient Records of the Church. Thus we find the Church of *Ephesus* govern'd by a Succession of single Persons from *Timothy*; the Church of *Creet* from *Titus*; of *Jerusalem* from *S. James* the Just; the Church of *Philippi* from *Epaphroditus*; of the *Colossians* from *Archippus*; of *Athens* from *Dionysius Areopogita*; of *Smyrna* from *St. Polycarp*; of *Perdamos* from *Antipas*; of *Theffalonica* from *Gaius*; of *Antioch* from *Evodius*; or as others, from *S. Ignatius*; of *Alexandria* from *Anianus*; of *Rome* from *Linus*, &c. And in all those Ancient Catalogues of one Succeeding another, their Subordinate Presbyters are not nam'd, as being under the Care and Inspection of their Ecclesiastical Governors.

II. It is next worth our Enquiry and Observation, in what Language the Ancients speak of Bishops, who are said to have Succeeded the Apostles. Let us begin with *S. Irenaus*, that most Venerable Bishop of *Lions*, who, in his Younger days, conversed particularly with *S. Polycarp*, and with several others who had been some of the Apostles and Apostolical Men; *Et habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, & Successores eorum usque ad nos, qui*

L. b. 3. Cap. 3.

nihil tale docuerunt neque cognoverunt quale ab his deliratur. And a little after, he Reasons against the *Valentinians* and their Foolish Mysteries, that no such Doctrine as they taught was delivered by the Apostles: for if the Apostles had reveal'd such Mysteries to any, they would not have conceal'd them from the Bishops; *Quos & Successores relinquebant suum ipsorum locum Magisterii tradentes.* And thus he goes on to prove, from the Successors of *S. Peter*, (and *S. Polycarp*, who was intimately known to himself) that the *Valentinian* Heresies were against the Apostolical Tradition; and we must take heed that *Irenaeus* carefully distinguish'd between Bishops and Presbyters. And what can be more honourably said of the Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction than that they hold *Locum Magisterii Apostolici.*

Lib. 3. Cap. 14.

Lib. 4. Cap. 63.

And again, the same *Irenaeus*, *Agnitio vera est Apostolorum Doctrina, & Antiquus Ecclesia status in Universo Mundo, & caractere Corporis Christi, secundum successiones Episcoporum, quibus illi eam qua in unoquoque loco est, Ecclesiam tradiderunt.* And again he tells us, that the Hereticks were much later, *quam Episcopi, quibus Apostoli tradiderunt Ecclesias.*

Lib. 5. Cap. 20.

Lib. 4. Cap. 43.

And again speaking of the Bishops, whom,
with

with regard to their Age, he calls *Presbyteri*, (for that is it that he Pleaded against the *Valentinians*, that the Doctrine which the Ancient Bishops received from the Apostles was Prior to their Fictions and Novelties;) and therefore he tells us, that we must obey them, *Qui successorem habent ab Apostolis* — *Qui cum piscopatus Successione charisma veritatis ritum, secundum placitum Patris, acceperunt.* Here you see, that the Episcopal and Aposto- Act. 1. cal Dignity are one in the Language of *Geneaus*. But we need not Insist on this. The Prophecy which threatned that the Bishoprick possessed by a Notorious Mafactor, should be given to another, was iterally fulfilled, when *Matthias* was advanc'd to the Apostolate in the room of *Judas*.

But that the Reader may see that there is nothing New in this Language that makes the ordinary Governors of the Church to Succeed the Apostles in their episcopal Authority, we may consult *Cyprian*; *Meminisse autem Diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, i.e. Episcopos & repositos? Dominus elegit.* And to shew the danger of concerning their Authority, he hath these Words; *Quod enim non Periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini, quando aliqui de Presbyteris, nec Evangelii,*

Evangelii, nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini iudicium, neque nunquam omnino (sub antecessoribus factum est, totum sibi vendicent? What S. Cyprian's Notion was of Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction is known to every body, that is not utterly a Stranger to Ecclesiastical Antiquity: You may take a hint of it from his 27 Epistle, Inde per temporum & successionum vices Episcoporum Ordinatio & Ecclesie ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constitutur, & omnis actus Ecclesie per eosdem gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque Divina lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse.

The same S. Cyprian in his 69 Epistle to *Florentius Pupianus* asserts, that the Bishops succeeded the Apostles *Vicaria Ordinatione*; and before him *Tertullian de prescriptionibus, percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedra Apostolorum suis locis Præsident, habes Corinthum, habes Ephesum, habes Romam.* And *Tertullian's* Notion of a Bishop is sufficiently known from his Book *De Baptismo*, in which he affirms, that the Presbyters and Deacons could do nothing without Express Licence from the Bishop.

*De Præscript.
Cap. 32.*

The Reader is intreated to read S. *Cyrian* himself; and then let him judge whether *Blondel* and his Associates are not disingenuous to the Highest Degree, who would endeavour to Engage him in their Faction, when he Expressly affirms, that the Bishops succeeded the Apostles, in their Authority over the Church, (both Presbyters, Deacons, and Laity) as established *Divina Lege*. And that by the same Law it is appointed, *ut omnis Ecclesiæ per eosdem gubernetur*. So that it is needless to Cite later Fathers in this Question, who frequently assert the same things. Nay, S. *Jerome* himself (as formerly proved) declares that they had the room of the Apostles.

Secondly, Let us Enquire (according to our propos'd Method) whether the Ancients insisted frequently on this Succession of Single Persons to the Apostles in Particular *Sees*, in their Reasonings against Hreticks? And here it is needless to repeat what I have already cited from *Irenæus*, who reasons against the Fabulous Dreams of the *Valentinians* from the Catholic Tradition, preserv'd by the Apostolical Succession of Bishops in the Particular *Sees* of *Rome* and *Smyrna*.

Another Testimony from *Tertullian*, is as Memorable as it is Express'd, and
Positive

Positive to our Purpose; *Edant ergo origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordine Episcoporum suorum, ita per Successiones a initia decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viri qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem & antecessorem; hoc enim modo Ecclesia Apostolica census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnaeorum Ecclesia Polycarpum ab Johanne conlocatum refert, &c.—Perin utique & cetera exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostoli seminis traduces habeant.*

Thus reasoned that Ancient Father so near the Apostolical Age, and thus he informs us, that the Catholic Church reasoned against Hereticks in his Days and by this Succession of True and Lawful Bishops succeeding one another in the room of the Apostles, and preserving the Catholic Tradition delivered to them by their first Founders, the Church distinguished her self from the Synagogues & Hereticks: For it was Necessary for every Bishop, when he entered upon the Government of his Particular See, to make it evident to the whole Church that he held nothing but the Catholic Faith according to the common Standard maintain'd by the Succession of all the Bishops his Predecessors, from the very first Apostolical

apostolical Plantations; so that it was easy for them to find out the first innovations and defections (if any such were attempted by any of their Bishops,) for in that case the Author of any such Errors must desert the Doctrine of his immediate Predecessor. And being so near to the Apostolical Age, the Testimonies of Antiquity that were then extant, their Zeal and Unanimity in preserving the Apostolical Doctrine, and the Synticks kept in particular Churches, made this Method not only easy, but also a convincing Argument against Heretics.

And again, the same Author, *habebimus & Johannis alumnas Ecclesias, nam est Apocalypsin Marcion respuat, ordo tamen episcoporum ad Originem recensus in Johannem stabit auctorem.* So that the Doctrine maintained by every Bishop, might be easily traced to its first Original. And thus the Ancients generally reasoned in those Days against the Hereticks; and whatever the force of that Argument might be, (perhaps founded upon some particular Practice and Method of preserving the Apostolical Traditions, with which we are not at this distance thoroughly acquainted) yet it proves this much beyond contradiction, in the matter of fact, 1. That such a Succession there was,

was, and 2. That such a Succession was by the most Ancient Fathers judged a proper Argument to convince the Hereticks, and how weak a reasoning had this been, if the imaginary interval of Parity was at any time known to the first Christians? how easily might the Hereticks insult over the learnedst of the Ancients, if at any time this Succession of Bishops, governing Ecclesiastical Affairs, in particular Sees, was interrupted upon the removal of the Apostles? How easily might they tell them in the Language of later Ages, that tho' Episcopacy was introduced above the Presbyterate in the second *Century*, yet for 30 or 40 Years after the Apostles, there was a perfect *Equality* amongst them: and then those reasonings of the Catholick Ancients, from the Succession of single Governors in particular *Sees*, vanish into nothing, if in those Days the evidence of History was full against them.

And it is not possible to imagine, but that the Hereticks, who watch'd all opportunities to ruin the Catholick Unity and Doctrine, would have expos'd their Pretences with all possible Advantages, if the Succession of single Bishops had not been as well known, and as much received as any matter of *Fact* relating to the Christian Religion: For the first
Historians

Historians do not narrate it as a thing doubtful or contested, but rather as a Truth uniformly received, and universally supposed by all Christians. Thus *Hegesippus* traces the Succession of Bishops in the Apostolical Sees; and *Clemens* * * *Alexandrinus*, who, as we have heard, makes the gradations of the Christian Hierarchy to be imitations of the Angelical Glory,) informs us of the Original Plantation of Churches by *S. John* the Apostle, that *after he returned to Ephesus from Patmos, being desired, he went into the Neighbouring Provinces, partly that he might constitute Bishops, partly that he might form entire Churches, and partly, that he might separate for the sacred Function such as were pointed to him by the Holy-Ghost.*

*Apud Euseb.
lib. 3. vid. etiam
Vindicias
S. Ignat. part.
2. p. 5.*

And it is upon the Faith of such Histories, recorded by Apostolical Men, who were competent Witnesses of the matter of *Fact*; that the Ancients did reason from their Apostolical Succession, to overthrow the Heresies that molested the Church: Such an Argument deserv'd to be the less regarded, if it depended upon the peculiar Speculations and Reasonings of any one single Bishop or Presbyter, But when we meet with it as a thing generally insisted on, not only in one Age, but

but by a constant and perpetual Tradition and Practice, transmitted to Posterity in after Ages; we must suppose that they could not be mistaken in an Argument, upon which so much depended.

Nay, this Succession of single Persons governing particular Churches, in the room of the Apostles is so evident, that some of the learnedst of the Gallican Church have yielded, not only their Succession, but their Jurisdiction and Preeminence also. So much is granted by *du Moulin*, in one of his Letters to the Bishop of Winchester, *Denique quomodocunque appellaveris Titum, & Timotheum, & Marcum, seu Episcopos, seu Evangelistas, constat eos habuisse Successores Episcopos, heredes illius praeminentia.* And this is all that is contended for, that they are the Spiritual Heirs of those Apostles or Apostolical Men, from whom they had their Original Mission and Authority.

Thirdly, Let us enquire whether we may safely lean on the Authority of the Ancients in an Affair of this Consequence? And there is no doubt but that we may, and that we ought; especially considering that they were so near to the Apostolical Age. It is certain, that the Apostolical Churches had their own *Fasts* in which were recorded the Succession of their

*Inter Opuscul.
Episcop. Win-
ton.*

their Bishops, and the names of those Martyrs who have suffered amongst them. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. To these *Tertullian* appeals, (as I lately mentioned) *edant Origines Ecclesiarum suarum*. And is it possible that *Hegeſippus*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Tertullian*, could be mistaken as to the Public Registers and Transactions of those Days, since many Apostolical Monuments (besides the *Faſti Eccleſiaſtici*) were then extant?

If the matter under debate had been a Question relating to some particular *Theorems* and Speculations of the Christian Religion, they might be mistaken, as many have been in such Cases, who lean'd too much on their own skill and judgment. But when their Testimony is *Uniform*, and in a matter of *Fact*, visible in the Practice of the Church, from the very beginning, which must needs be obvious to the Knowledge and Observation of the meanest Christian, it is impossible to imagine that they imposed upon us in an Affair of this Nature, unless we take it for granted, that the Christians, from the beginning have been a Society, who universally conspired to impose upon Posterity; and that there was not any one Man in that Age, to discover the Cheat, neither *Jew*, nor *Pagan*, nor *Heretick*.

Here we are carefully to distinguish between the Testimonies of the Ancients, as to particular *Doctrines* and *Theorems*, and their Testimony, as to the *Publick, Visible, Universally* received Practice of the Church. In the first they might be mistaken, because such *Theorems* might depend upon the strength of their *ratiocinative* and *intellectual* Faculty, and they had no Priviledge against Errours of that Nature. But we must not think that they lyed in a matter of *Fact*, far less was it possible for them to conspire to propagate such a Lie to future Generations.

2. They were Men of extraordinary sanctity, and upon all occasions ready to maintain the Christian Cause in the face of all danger, even to the Effusion of their Blood upon publick Scaffolds, and Theatres: They had moreover (many of them) the Gifts of discerning of Spirits, and other extraordinary and miraculous Advantages of which the Church was not altogether less destitute for some Ages after the Apostles; so that whether we consider their being so near to the Apostles, or their extraordinary advantages, or their unanimity in delivering this Testimony, or the Nature of the Testimony it self, the thing being a matter of *Fact*, twisted with the visible Practice of the Church

Church, upon these and such like Considerations, we must either receive this Historical Truth, or say, That no Age, nor no Society of Men in any Age, can transmit the knowledge of any matter of *Fact* to the next Generation. And if this be the Consequence of their rejecting the Testimony of the first Ages, we see not only how unreasonable, but how impossible it is to put in any exception against this Truth, supposing the Frame and Constitution of Human Nature, to be no other than it is.

When we plead Antiquity for the Episcopal Government, we do not only intend, that it was received in the first Ages by some Men, and in some Churches, (for the most damnable Heresies might have been so received) but our meaning is, that it was from the beginning; that it was established by Divine Authority; that the Polity of the Christian Church is but a true Copy of that which was appointed under the Jewish Oeconomy; that it was duly transmitted by the Apostles to single Successors, in particular *Sees*; that it was Perpetual and not Temporary; that the necessities of the Church in all Ages, do require that it should be preserved firm and inviolable to the end of the World; that the Apostles establish-

ed such a Polity in the Christian Church, that what was settled in the most eminent Churches, was also established in the more obscure and lesser Churches; That the Apostles were inspired by the Spirit of God, and established an uniformity in all Churches, as to that hedge of Government and Discipline, which was so necessary for preserving the Catholic Doctrine and Unity. Whence is evident, that there was not a different Polity in one Church, from what was established in another, but that the Face of the Primitive Church was uniform, and that this Constitution was established by Apostolical Authority.

Cor. as I ap-
point in all
Churches.

To this there is nothing answered that is fixt and solid. When our Adversaries are forced to yield, that *so* and *so* it was in the Churches that succeeded the Apostles, they tell us that the Ancients were erroneous in several things, which may be easily granted, without any danger to this Historical Truth, which depends not upon any particular Man's private Fancies or Reasonings, but upon the *early Catholick*, and *Universal* Tradition of the Church, in a matter of *Fact*, in which it was impossible either for the Church, or the most eminent Lights in the Church, to be imposed upon themselves

selves, or to impose upon following the Generations.

It is true, that some **E**rrours propagated by *Learned, Pious, and Popular Men*, may prevail for one Generation, and plead *Universality* in that Period; but this is far different from that *Constant, Perpetual, and Uninterrupted Tradition*, which we plead in our Cause. The *Doctrine of the Millennium* generally prevail'd in the first Ages, but it had no more **E**vidence and **C**ertainty, than what depended upon the accurate reasonings and sufficient Proofs of those who advanced it. They could offer nothing in its defence, but such Arguments as are in their own **N**ature fallible; and that it was maintained by several **A**ncients of great **N**ote in the **C**hurch; but the **T**radition we plead for, in favours of the **A**postolical **G**overnment, is quite of another **N**ature. The **A**postles established an **u**niformity of **G**overnment: They who transmitted the knowledge of this *Polity* to us, were sufficiently acquainted with the **A**postolical **C**onstitutions, which *Customs and Constitutions* were not only preserved in the **E**cclasiastical **R**ecords, but convey'd to their **E**yes, in the **D**ayly **P**ra^ctice of the **C**hurch.

If we found the Ancients reasoning for Episcopacy by some uncertain and probable Arguments, or insinuating that it was then opposed by some few, we might, in that case, suspect, that there was a design to introduce something into the Church, that was acceptable to the leading Men of that Age: But when we find the *Series* of single Successors, in all the Apostolical Churches, governing Ecclesiastical Affairs, and this Succession not asserted, as a thing that was then *opposed*, but rather *supposed*, a Tradition so stated and conveyed is as Authentic and infallible as any thing of that Nature can be.

Let us in the next place consider the dangerous Consequences they run upon, who do derogate from the Authority of this Traditional Conveyance, in a matter of *Fact*. For by the same reasons they must question the most sacred things of our Religion. It is certain, that the Christian Church did not *universally* and *uniformly* fix upon the number of the inspired Books that were received into the *Canon* of the Scriptures, before the Apostles left the World; for *several* Books that now we receive into the number of *Canonical Books* were disputed against, and questioned by Men of Eminent Authority, after the Apostles were removed. But

But the Church having made an accurate search into the Doctrine contained in those Books, and finding that it was agreeable to the Apostolical Standard, and that the Original Conveyance of such and such Books was supported by the Testimony of Apostolical Persons, or holy Men who conversed with such; upon this scrutiny, I say some Books were received into the *Canon*, which, upon their first appearance, were doubted of. Then I would gladly ask, if we receive the Testimony of the Ancient Church, after the Days of the Apostles, for the Authority of such and such Books now received into the *Canon*, how dare we dispute their Fidelity in a matter of *Fact* relating to the Polity of the Church, in which they could not be deceived, and in it self more universally attested than the other, which we receive without scruple? I leave this to the sober thoughts and calm reasonings of unbyassed and impartial Judges. For if we are perswaded that they were competent Judges of what Books ought to be received into the *Canon* of the Scriptures, after the Apostles left the World, and that they were endued with spiritual sufficiencies, and extraordinary Gifts, to make true and exact Enquiries in a thing of this Nature; how unreasonable is it,

nay, how impious to imagine, that they did not plainly, and without disguise, convey to us the outward and visible Polity of the Church? So that upon the whole matter, either we must receive their Testimony, in a matter of *Fact* so uniformly, and so universally convey'd, or we must question the Authority of some Books as are now received into the *Canon*. For several Objections may be moved against this last Tradition, which cannot be raised against the first: for the first was never questioned in the Ancient Church, but the last was oppos'd by Men of great Authority, and by several plausible Arguments before the matter was duly examined, and the conveyance of such and such particular Books exactly made known.

Arg. 2.

Let us in the next place consider the Concessions of the Learned Presbyterians in this Controversie; for some of them (and those the Men of greatest Reputation and Authority) do yield such *Propositions* as not only shakes, but quite overthrows the whole Fabrick of the New Doctrine. I begin *First* with the Learned *Salmasius* writing against *Petavius*, at-
qui Heretici illi quos vocas — nusquam negarunt antiqua etiam tempora discrimen illud inter Episcopos & Presbyteros agnovisse

Walo Mess. p.
(ubi) 7.

viffe, qui sciunt rem esse antiquissimam, ut duo hi ordines in Ecclesiâ fuerint distincti, Episcoporum & Presbyterorum, si excipiantur Apostolica tempora quorum ævo, ut eorum scripta testantur nullam constat eorum ordinum fuisse distinctionem. So that according to *Salmasius*, there was a Distinction always between Bishop and Presbyter, excepting the Days of the Apostles. Again, tho' he affirms, that Bishop and Presbyter were the same in the Apostolical Age, yet he grants, that the Apostles called themselves Bishops and Presbyters; so that the Argument (so much insisted on by him and others) from the equality and confusion of Names, can never infer an equality of Offices; sed & ipsi porro apostoli se Episcopos & Presbyteros nominabant ut ex honoris consortio pares videntur illis, quibus Ecclesias curandas acrendas committebant.

Again he grants, that the Ancients termed *Timothy* to be Bishop of *Ephesus*, and Apostle. But I need not weary the Reader, or accumulate concessions from *Salmasius*: I will only Name one or two more, *Jacobus ergo Apostolus, quem volunt ab Apostolis Episcopum esse ordinatum super Episcopos illos minores constitutus videbatur, eodem plane jure quo hodie unus Episcopus pluribus Presbyteris præst. Ab Apostolis cum Hierosolymorum*

Walo Mesi. p.
17.

Walo Mesi. p.
41, 42.
P. 45.

rosolymorum Episcopum ordinatum Clemens Alexandrinus scripsit. Alii ab ipso Christo volunt istam ἐπίσκοπον accepisse. So here we have a *Diocesan* Bishop established by the Apostles, in the Person of S. James the just, in the City of Jerusalem.

p. 181.

Again, *mutatam regiminis Apostolici formam, post Apostolorum Petri & Pauli obitum non invitatus etiam concesserim, ita tamen unverissimum sit, haud statim ab eorum obitu novum huncce morem cepisse.* And again *circa finem primi sæculi & initium secundum id invaluisse suspicor.*

p. 207.

Monseigneur Blondel is not so liberal and ingenuous, yet we have reason to thank him too for some Concessions that are very useful. Thus he yields, that before the Year of our Lord 140. the single Spiritual Episcopacy of one over many Presbyters, did not prevail; *quod ante annum centesimum quadragesimum evenisse idonee vix quisquam probaverit.* Again, in his Preface he grants, that tho' there might be many Thousand Christians in several Cities in the Apostolick Days, yet there were not so many Churches in that City as there were Congregations, but only one Church. But this could not be so unless they were knit together by their Dependence upon one Bishop, as some of those places cited by Blondel himself, in the

Apol. p. 3.

Prefat. p. 76.

the

the Margin of his Preface, sufficiently proves.

I have named the Learned *Du Moulin* before, as more Liberal than any of them, for he grants that the Successors of *Timothy* and *Titus* were the *Episcopi heredes eorum pre-eminentia*.

And *Monsieur Bochart*, one of the greatest Criticks of the last Age, hath these words; *Interim Episcopale regimen se antiquissimum, & Paulo post Apostolos per universam Ecclesiam magno cum fructu continuasse, est mihi compertissimum.*

*Phaleg. p. 989.
Edit. 3. Lug.
Bar.*

Suppose then that *Du Moulin*, *Blondel*, *Almasius*, and *Bochartus* were sitting in Council together, and one should ask them, when it was that this great Corruption that prepared the way for Antichrist (I mean Episcopacy) enter'd into the Christian Church. *Blondel*, who is the most Positive and the most Partial, tells you, that for 40 Years after the Apostles, the Golden Age of perfect Parity and Presbytery prevailed.

Bochartus says, that he dares not allow it such continuance; for he thinks that Episcopacy prevailed in the Christian Church, and that with great advantage to all the ends of true Religion and Piety, *Paulo post Apostolos*. By which Phrase we cannot extend the Duration of Presbytery,

bytery, in that Apostolical Period, beyond ten or twelve Years : So that in the year 113. the Episcopal Government was with great Advantage and Success established all over the Christian Church.

But *Salmasius* is the best natur'd Man in the World ; for he grants that *Episcopacy* prevailed a little after the Martyrdom of *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, long before the Death of *S. John*, and many other Apostolical Persons:

DuMoulin is as generous as any of them and the Conclusion is, they cannot tell when it began, but they are very sure it is a thing most Ancient, and as near the times of the Apostles as is possible, even from the beginning of the Second Century.

Let us now stand upon this Ground that the Adversary yields, and see what Batteries we can raise here to beat down the New Doctrine.

All over the Christian Church, a Bishop presiding over both Clergy and Laity, in every City, was the Ecclesiastical Government in that early Age, immediately after the Apostles, towards the beginning of the Second Century : then let me ask *quo molimine, quibus machinis*, was the Ecclesiastical Parity of Presbyters, (which the Apostles left the Church

in possession of) changed from that Equality into the *Prelacy* that is now complained of; especially since the Apostles established their Church Polity in great Unity and Uniformity?

The Gospel was at this time propagated over the whole *Roman Empire*, and far beyond it, even amongst those Britains that were not then Subdued by the Roman Arms. There was no general Council to appoint a Change of such vast Consequence as that of the Government of the whole Church must needs be. The *Change* it self could not creep insensibly into the Church: For such a *Change*, in the Ecclesiastical Government, lies open to the Observation of all Men, and every Man is tender of being incroached upon in his Rights and Liberties. The Church all this time (except for some Intervals) was under Persecution. Did all the Presbyters then all the World over, when they could not meet in Council; I ask if in that interval they conspired to Change the Ecclesiastical Government that was Established by Apostolical Authority? Did they so quickly agree upon a Change of such Consequence, even when they could not meet in any considerable Body, and was there none so Faithful amongst them all, as to oppose that New *Hierarchy*,
Anti-

Anti-christian in it self, and contrary to the Institution of our Saviour and his Apostles?

Were not the Ecclesiasticks of the Second Century (many of them) ordain'd by the Apostles or Apostolic Men? Now the Apostles had the Miraculous Gifts of Discerning of Spirits, and they were led by the Holy Ghost to such Persons as were best qualified for the Sacred Function. Shall we say of those that were chosen by the Holy Ghost himself, that were so ready to shed their blood for the testimony of Jesus, that even *they* were so forward to grasp a Power over their Brethren, that they could not but know was *Contrary to*, and *Subversive* of the Crown and Scepter of Jesus Christ?

Is this a thing to be imagined? Can it enter into the Heart of any Man that believes the other Parts of the Evangelical History, or whose Soul is moulded after the true Original frame of our Nature?

Let me then again once more ask, in the Name of Peace and Friendship, for my own Information, How this Change that is pretended by the Patrons of *Parity* was in it self possible, all things duly considered, so many Nations and of so many Languages, Tongues, and Kindreds, under so many Princes and Governors, whose Interests were different, and sometime opposite to one another, must needs agree

to this Change: the Churches of *Armenia* in the *East*, and *Spain* in the *West*, of *Afric* in the *South*, and *Britain* in the *North*, all of them shall agree in this Constitution, long before the first General Council for near 200 Years? How can this be, unless such a Constitution had been derived to them from the Apostles themselves? For if we believe that there was such an early Change, as is pretended, we may believe the most monstrous Absurdities that the most Poetical Fancy can put together; *Quicquid vel narrat fama, vel audet fabula.*

The Christian Religion was received in many Populous Cities in *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Afric*, when this Change is said to be made, when it was impossible that all the Clergy, or any considerable Number of them, or their Delegats could meet to examine the Expediency or Necessity of such a Change; and it was equally impossible that, tho' a great body of them could meet together, they could agree upon the change; and yet more impossible that (whether the attempt had prevail'd or not) we should hear nothing of it in all the Ecclesiastical Records; that no Historian took notice of it, tho' nothing was more memorable in all the Transactions of the Church; that we hear nothing of it in the Writings that
are

are extant, or in the Fragments of them that are lost, nor in the Histories of Contemporary Pagans.

What a strange miraculous Conspiracy this was, that no Man opposed such an Antichristian Enterprize; that those very Persons, who were marked out for the Sacred Function by the Holy Ghost, should venture upon a Constitution so contrary to the Apostolical Rule and Authority!

But if this pretended Change was agreed upon by some few Ecclesiasticks of Ambitious Designs, how came it to be so tamely submitted unto by all other Ecclesiasticks, without any Opposition or Delay? It is not easy to number the Absurdities that necessarily follow upon their *Hypothesis*; and therefore since the pretended Change, so circumstantiated, was in it self impossible, I may be allowed to say, that the first Original of Episcopacy was Divine and Apostolical: And there was no such Change, from *Parity* to *Pre-lacy*, because such Change in the early Ages of the Church, was altogether impracticable.

For let any Man name the Ordinary Methods by which a Change of that Nature could be brought about in such a manner as this is said to have happened, and then he will easily see that there was

no such thing; or if it has been, that there was nothing so Miraculous for the manner of it since the beginning of the World.

Let us but Superficially view some of the Consequences that will follow, if their *Hypothesis* be allowed. As *first*, that they who were marked for the Sacred Function by the Holy Ghost, after some Experience, judged it necessary to change the Government of *Parity* for *Prelacy*; that this Change was brought about not by any of the Ordinary Methods, by which things of that Nature are transacted amongst Mankind, but *instantly* and in a Miraculous manner; that the immediate Successors of the Apostles were all Presbyterians, but that those Presbyterians (most of them Martyrs for Christianity) preferred *Prelacy* to *Parity*; that in their Opinion there was no other remedy against Schism and Confusion. Such conclusions are Evident and Necessary, if their *Hypothesis* be allowed. But in the mean time, (contrary to their Intention) they establish Episcopacy upon a Sure and Divine Foundation, no less than if they had Asserted its immediate *Derivation* from Apostolical Practice and Authority: and therefore since we have the Universal Consent of the Christian

L Church,

Church, in the purest Ages, for the Episcopal Constitution, we must conclude, that it could be Established by no lower, or later Sanction than Divine and Apostolical Precept; for there was nothing Universally received of the whole Christian Church, in the First Ages, and without Contradiction, but what was deriv'd from Christ and his Apostles.

And if we meet with none before *Aerius* that ever opposed the Dignity and Jurisdiction belonging to the *High-Priest*, or *Presbyter*, which is all one, we may reasonably conclude, that this Ecclesiastical Polity was deriv'd from Divine Institution. And the Opposition that *Aerius* made to it, proceeded only from his own Pride and Ignorance, for he was beyond all measure ambitious; and it seems his Dulness and Stupidity were equal to his Ambition. He was not Successful in his Designs of being chosen a Bishop, and therefore he employed the little Talent that he had to assert that there ought to be no difference between a Bishop and a *Presbyter*.

It is not worth the while to insist upon *Aerius*. I resume the force of the Former Argument, that the Change from *Parity* to *Prelacy*, in that Period of the Church (wherein the *Presbyterians* grant

Prelacy

Prelacy to have Universally prevail'd) was in it self *absolutely* Impossible. By absolute *Impossibility* I do not mean *Impossibility* in the *Metaphysical* sense; but I only mean this much, that such a Change, from *Parity* to *Prelacy*, all things duly considered, with regard to the Constitution of Humane Nature, the Constancy, Piety, and Innocence of the first Christians, the Impossibility of managing a Conspiracy, to serve such a Design amongst so many Nations and Churches, in an *instant*, upon such a Supposition, I say, the pretended Change was Impossible, even as Impossible as it is for me alone, by my own Strength and Contrivance, to place the Earth much nearer the Sun than it is; for there is no *Metaphysical* Impossibility in the thing it self: but I am out of all hope to see any such Design take effect at any time, before the general Conflagration of the World; and therefore why shall we run our selves into such a Labyrinth as to endeavour to find a reasonable Cause for this pretended Change, when no such Cause can be named.

We conclude therefore, that the Superiority and Jurisdiction of a Bishop above a Presbyter was from the beginning; and this is the true Reason why we find it so Early and so Universally

acknowledged in the Ecclesiastical Records, not as a thing sprung up from Canonical Constitution, but rather co-eval with the Apostolical Plantations. We must not say, that the Primitive Church immediately succeeding the Apostles, so soon Apostatized from their Original Establishment; else we have no certain Standard to know what is Genuine and what is Supposititious in the whole frame of our Religion. For if *they*, who were marked for the Sacred Function by the Holy Ghost, so boldly ventured to change the Original Constitution, in things relating to the essential Order and Unity of the Catholic Church, they might make bold with other things as much as with these. And if the Universal Testimony of the First and Best Christians deceive us in a matter of *Fact*, I would trust them far less in a matter of *Opinion*: the *last* may depend upon their own private Skill and Judgment, but the *other* was Visible to all of them, and in the Practice of the Church; therefore we may be allowed to infer from the Concessions of the Learnedst Presbyterians, that the *Hierarchy* of *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon*, was in the Christian Church from the beginning, or in the Words of *Du Moulin*, the Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles, *Heredes eorum præ-eminentiæ.* When

When the Presbyterians first set up their *Geneva* Discipline, most of their Writings only pleaded that their new Constitution and Polity was allowable, and might be Defended as a thing Innocent, and in it self Subservient to good Designs. They thought it not convenient to pretend at that time to a *Jus Divinum* exclusive of all other Forms, though they made haste towards it upon all occasions. *Beza* in his Epistles to some of the English Bishops speaks softly, and in general Terms, and keeps at a distance from what was *directly* opposite to the Practice and Sentiments of those he wrote to; but when he writes to *Knox* he takes off the Mask, and hides nothing; and it is from Mr. *Knox* and Mr. *Melvil* our Countrymen have deriv'd all their Fire and Violence in this Controversie. Nay, they are of late so *Visionaire*, that they fancy no Evidence, no Record can be true or genuine that is against them: and this is the Reason why, in this last Age, the Learnedst of that Party take so much pains to Disprove all Testimonies that make any thing against their Scheme, though the Ancient Writings we alledge in favour of Episcopacy, have nothing in them contrary to the Doctrine and Simplicity of those Ages in which they

have been written: and though the citations of the Ancients, from those Writings, be the very same that are now to be seen; nay, though we have the successive Testimonies of all Ages, to confirm us in the belief, that such Writings are Genuine, yet if they give the least Countenance to, or Evidence for the Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*, they are immediately voted Supposititious and Spurious. This is the reason why *Daille* and others, were at so much pains to overthrow the Authority of *S. Ignatius* his Epistles; not that they found any thing in them, unagreeable to the Purity, Zeal, and Simplicity of those days in which they were written, but only because they contain irrefragable Proofs for the Authority and Dignity of Bishops over Presbyters. This is the reason why they have been at such extraordinary Pains to gather Objections against the Authority of *S. Ignatius* his Epistles.

But this Controversie is exhausted by the accurate Performances of the Incomparable Bishop of *Chester*, who has sufficiently proved that if the Epistles of *S. Ignatius* are not to be received as the genuine *Remains* of that Holy Martyr, no other Writings may be received, however convey'd, or carefully preserv'd. It is true, that now for a considerable time
the

the Presbyterians are well pleased not to hear of *S. Ignatius* his Epistles, (I mean the *Florentine* Copy, published by *Isaac Vossius*,) for they know that it is not safe for any of their number, either at home or abroad, to meddle with the Vindication of *S. Ignatius*, published by the Bishop of *Chester*. *Monſieur L'Arroque* made an attempt upon it; yet none of his own Party thought that the Book he pretended to Answer, received any considerable hurt by that Gentleman's Enterprize, though otherwise a Learned Man. But if the Reader is curious to see all that he gather'd together fully Examined and Refuted, he may consult *Le Nourry* his *Apparatus ad Bibliothecam maximam*. By Parisii, Anno 1694. which he may easily perceive, that nothing prompts our Adversaries to oppose the Authority of *S. Ignatius* his Epistles, but an uncurable Itch of Contradiction, and a boundless Ambition to support a Cause, for which they were never yet able to bring one plausible Argument.

'Tis no part of my Design to renew that debate which may be seen at length in the Writings of those that I have already named. Let me only ask the Calm and Judicious Presbyterian, what great loss are we at, if we should allow them to dispose of *S. Ignatius* his Epistles

as they please? Are our Evidences for Episcopacy less Clear or more Doubtful, if those Epistles were never written? Have not we the *Acts* of S. Ignatius his Martyrdom that distinguish *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon*, as fully as the Epistles of S. Ignatius do: and will they say that the Ecclesiastical Polity, when S. Ignatius wrote his Epistles, was different from that which prevailed when the *Acts* of his Martyrdom were recorded; so that it is no great matter to the debate in hand, whether they acknowledge the Epistles of S. Ignatius, or not. No good Argument was ever alledged against them, nor shall we ever hear of any hereafter; and most of those that *Daille* made use of, were levelled against the *interpolated* Epistles, rather than those Published from the *Medicean* Library.

Walo Mess. p.
253.

Nay, *Salmasius* himself yields the whole Cause as far as our Controversie is concerned; for he tells us, *Epistolæ illæ ratæ & suppositæ videntur circa initium aut medium secundi sæculi, quo tempore primus singularis Episcopatus supra Presbyteratum introductus fuit.* Now according to the Judgment of this Learned *Critic*, there is nothing found in the Epistles of S. Ignatius, that can prove them to be later than the beginning of the Second Century:

ry; and if so, whether they were written by *S. Ignatius*, or by another, he that wrote them, could not represent the Ecclesiastical Polity different from what it was in the days of *S. Ignatius*; because his Contemporaries knew what the Ecclesiastical Government was in the days of *S. Ignatius*, as well as he. When one *Personates* another, he must not make that other act, and speak things unagreeable to the Character he bore, and the time in which he lived, else he exposes himself to Laughter; and therefore since *Salmasius* grants, that for any thing he can guess, the Author of those Epistles lived towards the beginning of the Second Century, then I say, the Author of those Epistles, whoever he was, gave us a true Idea of the Ecclesiastical Polity towards the beginning of the Second Century: and though he should write them towards the middle of that Century, yet he must represent the Ecclesiastical Government such as he himself, and those in his own days thought *it* to have been in the days of *S. Ignatius*; for certainly, they knew very well what that Ecclesiastical Polity was which then prevail'd in the Church, being but so little removed from the time of *S. Ignatius* his Martyrdom. We must not think that the

Primitive

Primitive Martyrs and Bishops were either so Unskilful or so Unconcerned, that they knew nothing of the Visible Practice of the Church for some years before their own time, when many of them were then alive towards the middle of the Second Century, who had probably conversed with *S. Ignatius* himself, and more certainly with *S. Polycarp*. Upon the whole matter the Epistles of *S. Ignatius* are acknowledg'd to be so old, and to contain nothing unagreeable to the Simplicity of the First Ages, that they wish they had never appeared.

Few Books are better attested than the Epistles of *S. Ignatius*: and it is great Petulance for any Man, at the distance of 1600 Years, to pretend that he knows better what *S. Ignatius* wrote, than *Eusebius* did, who was a most accurate Searcher into all the ancient Monuments of the Church, that hardly could he be imposed upon in an Affair of this Consequence. The first Christians, who were so careful to gather up a few hard Bones that the Lions had not devoured, would no doubt be very watchful over the precious Remains of his Mind, and the last Exhortations that he wrote to several Churches as he went from *Antioch* to *Rome*.

That S. Polycarp made a Collection of those Epistles is past all doubt; and *Irenæus* cites them. And since it was not possible to obtrude Counterfeit Epistles upon the World, in the name of S. Ignatius, either in the days of S. Polycarp or *Irenæus*, how come we to think but that *Eusebius* might see the true Epistles? And it is acknowledged by *Daille* himself, that he had the same Copy of S. Ignatius that we now have. And what is cited from those Epistles by *Irenæus* and *Origen*, agree exactly with what is now found in the genuine Copy. And *Eusebius* was not accustomed to receive such Epistles, without an accurate Examination: and we find him frequently rejecting doubtful or supposititious Writings from this very Argument, that there was no mention made of them by the Ancients that went before him. It is not then to be suppos'd that he would have examined the Collection of S. Ignatius his Epistles that was transmitted to him.

To say no more of this Debate: the Epistles of S. Ignatius (as we have them from the *Florentin* MSS.) are as duly attested as any Monument of Antiquity can be: and I would desire any Man to give me a better Argument, why I must believe such and such Orations to have been

been

been written by *M. T. Cicero*; and yet must not believe that such Epistles were written by *S. Ignatius*. For I suppose *Polycarp* and *Irenæus* both understood the Circumstances and Conveyance of *S. Ignatius* his Writings, as well as he who first mentioned the Works of *M. T. Cicero*. And if there be no Objection against the Epistles of *S. Ignatius*, but that *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, are distinguished, we may, by the same Argument reject all the Ecclesiastical Writings of the Second Century, which distinguish themselves in the same manner, when there is an occasion for it.

I do not pretend, by what is already said, or by any thing that may hereafter be offered, that I am able to give greater light to this Controversie, by any performance of mine; nay, nor write so Accurately and Fully as very many have done; I am too sensible of my own Weakness and Circumstances to entertain any thoughts of that Nature. But this much I have said by way of Introduction to that *Debate*, which may be further illustrated when I am more fully acquainted with those Arguments that are brought by our Country-men for their late Plat form of Ecclesiastical Polity, which they would impose upon us, as the *Image* which

which fell down from *Jupiter*. And sup-
 posing my Reader to have considered
 with Candour and good Nature, what
 is already, (but very briefly) in sinu-
 ated; I beg his leave to re-capitulate
 what is here offered in our Defence, in
 a *Few, Plain, Material, and Obvious Que-*
ries.

Quer. 1. Whether the Argument plead-
 ed by the Presbyterians in favour of their
 Parity from the *Dichotomies* of the Cler-
 gy, found in the Scriptures, and some
 other ancient Monuments, be in it self a
 solid and reasonable Argument, against
 the Authority and Jurisdiction of a Bi-
 shop above a Presbyter; Since we meet
 with these *Dichotomies*, when 'tis certain
 the Office of a Bishop was distinguish'd
 from that of a Presbyter?

Quer. 2. Since the Apostles retain'd the
 Phraseology of the Jews, and that it is cer-
 tain, that the Jews spoke of Priests and
 Levites as two distinct Orders, without
 mentioning the High Priest, whether in
 that *Period*, it be reasonable to conclude,
 that the Office of High Priest was not
 above *that* of any ordinary Priest, be-
 cause the Jews when they speak of Priests
 do not at all times mention the High-
 Priest as a distinct Order from Priests or
 Levites?

Quer.

Quer. 3. Whether some of the Ancient when they *dichotomiz'd* the Clergy, do not in other places, Plainly and Positively reckon up the three distinct Orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon; and also, whether the Modern Arguments pleaded against the *Hierarchy* from such *Dichotomies*, be not in it self altogether Foolish and Sophistical?

Quer. 4. Whether the Apostolical Power, as to its *permanent*, *necessary*, and *essential* Branches, was not in its nature *Perpetual* and *Successive*; and by them transmitted *in solidam*, as they receive it from our Blessed Saviour to single Successors in particular *Sees*, and not to Colledge of *Presbyters* in the Modern Notion?

Quer. 5. Where and in what places of Scripture the Superiority and Jurisdiction of one *Priest* above another is forbidden? and if it be not plainly forbidden, then the fancy of a *Jus Divinum* in favours of Presbytery (such a one is exclusive of all other Forms of Ecclesiastical Government) is Groundless and *Chimerical*.

Quer. 6. Whether (all things duly considered) a more evident and universal

Tradition for the superiority and jurisdiction of a Bishop above Presbyter, can be reasonably demanded; and whether the Argument from universal Tradition, be not in this case the most proper and most necessary? and whether the Tradition for the superiority of a Bishop above Presbyter, be not more universal, unanimous and uncontradicted, in the Primitive Ages, than many other Traditions that are unquestionably received?

Quer. 7. Whether the Ecclesiastical Government could be changed from Parity to Prelacy, (as is pretended) in those early Ages of the Church, especially since some Apostles and several Apostolical Men surviv'd the Period, fixt by some Presbyterians, for the beginning of this pretended Change; and if the Change was in it self impossible, then Prelacy must needs be acknowledged Apostolical.

Quer. 8. Whether the Opinion of St. Jerome be not disingenuously represented by the Presbyterians, since he never acknowledged nor affirmed any Interval, after the Death of the Apostles, in which Ecclesiastical Affairs were governed, *communis Presbyterorum consilio*?

Quer. 9.

Quer. 9. Whether there is any good and solid Argument brought by the Presbyterians, against the Authority of St. Ignatius his Epistles, that is not already sufficiently answered?

A plain and solid Answer to these few *Queries* will almost exhaust this Controversie. So much I thought fit to say a present, to let our Countrey-men see, that the fancy of a *Jus divinum* propagated by our Presbyterians, is vain and *Enthusiastic*, as it is new and *Sophistical*, and opposite to the current Practice of the universal Church, for 1400 Years after the Apostles; and therefore, such as zealously impose this New Discipline upon the Clergy or People, as if it were of Divine Institution, can deserve no other Name than that of Impostors and false Prophets.

The most intelligent of our Adversaries do not deny, but that a certain Presidency was lodg'd in one Bishop above several Presbyters, from the Days of the Apostles. So the Quarrel is not (as they pretend) so much against Episcopacy, as against the large extent of their Dioceses and the encrease of their Power over what it was in the Primitive and purest Ages. As for the last of these, the Power of Bishops over Presbyters, in the manage-
men.

ment of all Ecclesiastical Affairs, was in those Days much more absolute than in these. The first and Original Rule of Ecclesiastical Government being that nothing was to be done without the Bishop, no not those Acts of Ecclesiastical Power, which were within the compass of the Priestly Order. The subordinate Clergy were not to Baptize without his express Licence, as *Tertullian* witnesseth, and *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth* writing *ad Gnostios*, puts *Pinytus* the Bishop of that Church in mind, *Μη̄ Βαρύ φορτίον ἐπιναγκῆς τὸ θελ̄ ἀσνείας τοῖς Ἀδελφοῖς ὑπιπιδέναι.* So it was in his Power, it seems, to restrain the Presbyters from Marriage, for the word *Ἀδελφοί* cannot be extended to other Christians, than those of the Clergy, since a Power to restrain the Laity from Marriage was never pretended to, by any Bishop in any part of the Christian Church; and *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth* flourished about the year 170. See then how high the Power of Bishops were towards the middle of the second Century; and the Apostolic Canons, or the Rules of Primitive Discipline, which have been gathered together, towards the end of the second Century, or beginning of the third, frequently put us in mind of the Power of Bishops over Presbyters and

*Apud Eusebium
Hist. Ecclesiast.*

Laity, in all Spiritual Affairs, as also the Genuine Epistles of St. *Ignatius*, thō we should allow them to be no other than what *Salmasius* himself grants, *Confictæ ad initium aut medium secundi seculi.*

As to the other Pretence, That in those days there was no *Diocesan* Episcopacy. 'Tis but a poor *Logomachy*, invented only to darken the Controversie, and to perplex the thoughts of illiterate People; for the word *Διόκωνος* is but borrowed from the civil Government to the Ecclesiastical, and tho' the Diocesses in the Ecclesiastical sense, bear no proportion to the extent of those Diocesses, into which the Roman Empire was divided; yet they may very well signifie the bounds of such a particular Bishop's Inspection and Government, as well as any other that was formerly used. Words do change daily, and the bounds of Episcopal Jurisdiction, were never Geometrically measured. The extent of their Diocesses must be now regulated by Human Laws, and if the Diocesses are wider in some places than convenience would allow; this does not at all change the Nature or Authority of Episcopal Jurisdiction. A Presbyter is the same Man, and his Office the same, in a little Parish, as in a larger; and perhaps there are not two Diocesses in the whole Christian Church, exactly equal

equal to one another. A Bishop and his Presbyters govern'd the Ecclesiastical Affairs of such a City, and its Territories. If afterwards, some parts of his Diocess were annex'd to another Diocess, such a circumstantial or *Modal* alteration did not at all change the Nature of the Government.

Nay, this is such an exception, as is invented only to amuse ignorant People. *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, successor to *Fabianus*, in his time had 44 Presbyters, yet he was no other with regard to his Power and Authority, than the first Bishops of *Rome*, who perhaps might have but two or three. When *Gregorius Thaumaturgus* entered upon his Bishoprick of *Neocæsaria*, there were but 17 Christians in that large City. Perhaps one Presbyter at that time was sufficient, or, it may be, no subordinate Officer was necessary. He alone might attend the Spiritual necessities of so many; but he was so successful in his Ministry, that when he came to die, there were but 17 Pagans in that great City. I hope it cannot be pretended that when they were all converted, they met all in one House for Worship; and therefore, there were several Congregations who had several Presbyters to Officiate, but still under the Inspection

of one supream Bishop: These variations in the number of the faithful, and the bounds of his inspection, made no change at all, neither in him nor in the Nature of his Dignity and Jurisdiction.

It is unreasonable to quarrel the *Diocesan* Model of Episcopacy, which is so lively represented in the City of *Jerusalem*, under the Episcopal inspection of *St. James* the just, who was plac'd Bishop of that Church by the Apostles themselves, which *Blondel* dare not openly deny; at least, he must oppose all Antiquity, if he contradicts it. There needs no other thing then to be enquired into, than whether the Christians of *Jerusalem* for some years after the Ascension of our Lord, could meet in one Congregation; and if not, then the Question is ended by the most infallible demonstration in our favours. *Act. 6. 7.* we read, that *the word of God encreas'd and the number of the Disciples multiplied greatly in Jerusalem, and a great Company of the Priests became obedient to the Faith.* In those days the Text saith, that the number of the Disciples was multiplied. We read *1 Cor. 15: 6.* That our Saviour before his Ascension, appeared to *Five hundred Brethren at once, Acts 2. 41.* about *Three thousand Souls are add'd unto the Church,* again, *Five thousand*

thousand. All this time the Apostles daily in the Temple, and in every House, ceased not to Teach and Preach Jesus Christ. and *Act*s, 5. 13. 14. Believers were the more added unto the Lord, multitudes both of Men and Women. Nay, their Miracles were so famous, that Multitudes came out of the Cities round about, unto Jerusalem, and brought their sick Folks unto the Apostles, and *Act*. 21. 20. St. James and his Elders observed to St. Paul, that many Thousand of the Jews were converted. *Trou se st Brother, πρου μυριαδιν, how many myriads are converted to Christianity.* Many of the Priests were converted, the Miracles of the Apostles were undenyable; they became bold and assiduous after the effusion of the Holy Ghost; and tho' the Sanhedrim might be filled with Indignation, yet the Body of the People had no Prejudices against the Christians at this time. The Apostles continued at Jerusalem for several Years after the Ascension of our Saviour. Here it was that the first Preachers of the Gospel began with Divine Life and Vigour. Here the *vail of the Temple was rent, the Rocks cleft in sunder, and they that rose from the Dead appeared to many.* Add to all this the wonderful Veneration that the Inhabitants of Jerusalem had for the Person of S. James the Just, and

Apud Josephum.

if the Progress of the Gospel was in any measure proportionable to those first Beginnings, the number of Christians in *Jerusalem* must exceed several Congregations, even by a modest Computation. And we find the earliest Accounts of Ecclesiastical Historians agree to the Accounts of *St. Luke*. For *Hegesippus* tells us, That, by *S. James* a great many of the *Sc-
daries* who neither believed a Judgment to come, nor a Resurrection, were Converted by him; That a great many of the Rulers and Principal Men in the City were by his Ministry brought to believe the Gospel. The Jews made an Uproar, the Scribes and Pharisees saying, that it was to be feared that all the People would turn Christians.

I know there are a great many Evasions insisted on by the later Presbyterians, to shun the force of all Arguments; but it is then only seasonable to consider those Exceptions, when we are particularly acquainted, which of them they most trust to. As for the Cavillings against Diocesan Episcopacy, they are, with so much Judgment and Evidence dissipated by the Learned Doctor *Mau-
rice* in his Treatise on that Subject, that it will be their Wisdom to consider that Book, before they renew their former Arguments. And Mr. *Clarkson* has, con-
trary

Apud Euseb.
Lib. 2 Cap. 23.
Πολλῶν μὲν καὶ
Ἰσραηλῶν ἀρχόντων
πιστεύοντων,
&c.

London Printed
Anno 1691.

trary to his own Intention, served the Church, when his Discourse of Primitive Episcopacy occasioned the Publishing of that excellent Treatise.

The Vindicator of the Kirk of *Scotland* tells us, that we ought to answer *Blondel* and his Brethren. He knows very well, that this might be retorted with Advantage; but I chuse rather to inform him, that there is not any one Instance in *Blondel*, *Daill*, or *Salmasius*, that has not been frequently answered already. Let him consult those Authors, (and it is not probable, that he, or any of his Brethren, can add any thing to their Collections: and we desire to know from him what those Arguments are, either from Scripture, Reason, or Authority, in defence of Presbytery, that are not sufficiently answer'd, to the Satisfaction of all unbiass'd Men, many years before the late *Revolution*.

C H A P. III.

Of several other New Opinions, propagated by the Presbyterians of Scotland.

THE next New Opinion that I take notice of, is, That our Presbyterians of *Scotland* teach the People that it is Superstitious and Unlawful to observe the great Holy-Days of our Saviour's Nativity, Resurrection, and Ascension; or to Commemorate (in their anniversary Returns) the Piety, Faith, and Martyrdom of those Saints that are mentioned in the Holy Scriptures. This is certainly a New Doctrine, and flies in the Face of the whole Christian Church, Ancient and Modern, Reformed and Unreformed. And there needs no other Argument to expose the Superstitious Peevishness of our Adversaries in this Particular, than that they oppose the Practice of all Reformed Churches, both *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, excepting only the Church of *Geneva*, who in a popular Hurry, without the Knowledge or Interposal of *Calvin*,
abolished

abolished the Observation of Holy-Days: Nay, *Calvin* solemnly protests that he had no hand in it; *Ego (inquit) sanctè testari possum me inscio, ac nec optante quidem hanc rem (Festorum abrogationem) fuisse transactam.* And in another place; *Quum Plebiscito audivi abrogatos esse dies illos, adeo res erat inexpectata ut propemodum obstupuerim.* And our first Reformers in *Scotland*, though Warm and Precipitate enough, never thought of any Project so Giddy and Singular. Our Countryman *Buchanan* is Positive and Express, that upon a certain Occasion they Solemnly signed an Uniformity with *England*; *Religionis Cultus, & Ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripserunt.* And the French Protestants, though they built much after the Model of *Geneve*, yet they retained still the Observation of the great Holy-Days. In a Word, to teach that the Religious Observation of such Holy-Days is Unlawful and Superstitious, is to censure the Wisdom of all Ages, and the most Ancient Constitutions of the Christian Church. They were Originally appointed to Commemorate the Mysteries of our Redemption with all possible Zeal, Gratitude, and Solemnity. If it be said that they are abused to Excess and Riot, so may the most Holy Exercises be abused,

Epist. ad Hallesium.

ad Min. Burenf.

Buch. Hist. Lib. 19.

abused, and the Highest Mysteries: and there is nothing so sacred in Religion, or so Universally useful in Nature, against which some such Objection may not be started

Def. Vind. p. 27. The Question is not, (saith the Vindicator of the Kirk of Scotland) about the Commemoration of it, (*viz.* the Nativity) but whether this Commemoration shou'd be by an Ordinance of God, or by an Appointment of Man.

What the Church doth in this, is agreeable to the Will of God. And if the manner of Commemoration (*viz.* by an Anniversary Solemnity) be the immediate result of Ecclesiastical Constitution, the Church meddled with no more than what was left by our Saviour, to her Power to determine. Things *Indifferent* in their Nature, do generally carry in them the Advantages and Encouragements of *Necessary* things: and God will have our Obedience approved in indifferent things, as well as Necessary; for if Necessary things are approved for their intrinsic Excellency, the other are by way of *Consequence* and *Relation*. When we Commemorate the Nativity, we Worship God, and adore his Love that sent his Son into the World; and the Church commands that this should be performed with all possible Solemnity at some stated and fixed Seasons. May not the Christian

Christian Church appoint those Seasons, which are but Circumstances of Time) as well as the Jewish Church appointed the Hours of Prayer, at which the Apostles Acts 2. 15. & 3. 1. were present, and for which there was no immediate and Express Institution of God? But were kept by an Appointment and Custom of their own.

There is something *Analogical* in the Christian Church to the Free-will Offerings of the Jews, which are not the less acceptable, because Voluntary; but rather the more, as long as they are within the Circle of those things that are allowable, and that he himself hath commanded: Such we reckon Prayers and Praises, which are never a whit the less acceptable to God, that they are in their Publick and Solemn Seasons regulated by Ecclesiastical Authority. Is there any thing in this that is not within the Power of the Church to determine? The Doctrine of the Presbyterians in this Particular, is opposite to the Sentiments of all Christian Churches: and it is needless to gather many Citations to this purpose; they may be seen at length in *Durell's* his *Vindication*. Vind. Eccle. Anglic. cap. 13 And since the Jewish Church might appoint Religious Anniversary Solemnities, not immediately Instituted by God himself, I see no reason why the Christian Church may not do the like.

OF

Of this the Author of the Apology gave two Instances, the *Fasts* mentioned in *Zachary 7.* and the *Feast* of the Dedication, 1 *Maccab. 4. 59.*

To the first, the Vindicator Answers that those *Fasts* mentioned *Zach. 7.* were *disown'd by God*; but he leaves us to guess what Words of Scripture he builds this Fancy upon: and I cannot but approve his Conduct, because his Exposition of that Text of *Zach. 7.* is as New, and Unheard of, as his Interpretation of *Ordinatio* in *S. Jerom's* Epistle to *Evagrius.*

The Jews are said *not to have Fasted unto God, Zach. 7.* notwithstanding of their outward Penitential Solemnities because *they did not hear the former Prophets when Jerusalem was inhabited.* And this Admonition is again renewed by *Zach. ver. 9. Execute true Judgment, shew mercy and compassion every man to his Brother, and oppress not the Widow nor the Fatherless, the Stranger nor the Poor, and let none of you imagine evil against his Brother in your Heart.* If the Jews had had regard to these Moral Instructions, their Solemn Fasts had been acceptable to God, though appointed by Human Authority; nor were they ever reprov'd upon the account of the first Institution of such Fasts, but merely because they were Trifling and Superficial in the

Performance, and came to those Solemnities with their Injustice, Fraud, and Oppression.

The Phrase that perhaps the *Vindicator* would insist on, is *ver. 5. Did ye at all Fast unto me, even unto me*, only insinuates, that they were Careless, Indevout, Immoral, and Irreligious in their Publick appearances before God. And in other places we find Expressions of higher Indignation, and greater Aversion against the Solemnities of God's own immediate Appointment, when they were not perform'd with true Innocence, Contrition, and Sincerity, *Isa. 1. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, To what purpose is the multitude of your Sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord, when you come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand to tread my Courts?* Now put the case, that there had been such an Expression as this made use of, with regard to those Fasts mentioned *Zech. 7. who hath required this at your hand*, then it would be impossible to perswade the *Vindicator*, but that the Institution of those Solemnities was plainly struck at, and not the Manner of their Performance only; yet all are agreed, that the Institution is not found fault with by *Isaiab*, notwithstanding of such Expressions; but only that the *Jews* were Profane and Irreligious in their most Solemn Addres-

ses

ses. And I desire the *Vindicator* would be pleased to tell me where he finds the Institution of such Fasts blamed: For the Context, *Zach. 7.* sufficiently shews wherein they came short of their Duty. *They Oppressed the Poor, the Fatherless and the Widow*; so that, in the company of such Abominations, they could not be said to Fast unto God, The *Vindicator* desires that we should prove that those Fasts were only disown'd upon the Account of their Irreligious Performance. To which I answer, that there is nothing else blamed. If he say that the Institution it self is found fault with, this is an *Affirmative Proposition*, and we have better Reason to desire him to prove an *Affirmative*, than he can have to oblige us to prove a *Negative*.

Def. Vind. p. 32.

Again, the *Vindicator* tells us, that *Christ and the Prophets had so many things of greater moment to reprove and insist particularly upon, that they contented themselves to comprehend such things as these, (viz. Solemnities of Human Institution) under general Reproofs.*

Ibid.

It seems then that *Christ and the Prophets* did not particularly reprove the Human Institution of Feasts and Fasts. We are obliged for this discovery to the sharp sighted Presbyterians, who see Consequences that were never seen in any former

mer Age. But there are two Scriptural Instances brought by the *Vindicator* to prove the Human Institution of Feasts and Fasts unlawful. The first is, *1 Kings 12. 33.* *Jeroboam* (he says,) *is reprov'd for devising Holy-days that God had not appointed.* And thus he leaves the History of *Jeroboam.* But I would intreat him to read the Chapter from the beginning to the end, and not to impose upon himself and his Readers at this rate, (for it is of greater consequence to disguise the History of the Scripture, than the Stories of the Rabble, and the Persecutions that the Clergy met with) and then he will find that *Jeroboam* openly and avowedly forsook the Worship at the Temple of *Jerusalem*, and made unto himself two Calves of Gold, and said unto the People, *it is too much for you to go up unto Jerusalem. Behold thy Gods O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt. So he offered upon the Altar at Bethel, to the honour of those Calves of Gold.* And this is nothing less than the forsaking the true God, and his Worship, and turning Idolater, in opposition to God and his plain and express Institutions of Worshipping at *Jerusalem.* If *Jeroboam* had appointed a Feast in honour of the true God, and had commanded the People to bring their Sacrifices to *Jerusalem*, to be offered unto him, and
not

not to the two Golden Calves at *Bethel*; then I suppose he ought not to be blamed; for he and the People would have only offered to God, some portions of their time for Sacrifices, Prayers, and Praises, which were not expressly required by the Law, and yet would be acceptable as free will Offerings, when they were presented at the Altar in *Jerusalem*. The sum of his Argument is no more than this; the Idolatry of *Jeroboam*, who set up the two Golden Calves at *Bethel*, is to be blamed; ergo, the Observation of any Religious Anniversary solemnity, in honour of the true God, is unlawful. And if the *Vindicator* please himself with such Consequences, he may enjoy the satisfaction of his own Dream. I know no Man so cruel as to give him any disturbance.

But there is another plain Text that condemns such solemnities in the Opinion of the *Vindicator*, and that it is *Matth. 15. 9. in vain do they Worship me, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of Men*. Teaching for *Doctrines* in the Language of the New-Testament, is the affirming such a thing to be the Command or immediate Will of God, when it hath no other Original Authority, than Human institution. To pretend that an invention of our own is *immediately* enacted by God, or to set it up against any known

Vid. Spencer. de legibus Hebræorum.

Hammond. Pract. catech, p. 203.

known Law of his, is the crime noted by that Phrase, and nothing else but what shall bear some *Analogy* to *that*; and therefore the Crime here reproved, is not chargeable on those who own the stated Feasts and Fasts of the Church to owe their beginning to Ecclesiastical Constitution, and do not at all pretend that they were *immediately* prescrib'd by our *Saviour*; far less do they set them up in opposition to any of his Commandments, and Institutions, but rather in a perfect subordination to all of them, and with a pious design to commemorate both his Laws and Benefits, with all possible Zeal and solemnity. This is not *to teach for Doctrines, the Commandments of Men*, but rather to make the Commandments of Men subservient to the keeping the Commandments of God. And when Human Authority is thus employed, the Commandments of Men are observed with an Eye to the Commandments of God. We do not pretend that we have any *express* institution in the New-Testament, for celebrating the Christian *Festivities*. We know that they owe their beginning to the Piety and Wisdom of the Apostles, or their Successors; and they were appointed for no other end, than that the several steps of our redemption might make the most lasting impression in our Memories.

Another place cited by the *Vindicator* against the Christian *Festivities*, is *Jer. 7. 31.* It is very difficult to guess his meaning or design in citing this Text. *To burn their Sons and their Daughters in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom*, was in it self abominable. God commanded no such Worship; *ergo*, to appoint a time for the solemn and Religious performance of that true Worship, which he himself commanded, falls under the same Censure. The *Vindicator* must certainly suppose his Adversary to be very tame, if he thinks that such Fooleries pass for the Exercises of Reason; besides the Phrase *which I commanded them not*, hath in it a manifest *Meiosis*, i. e. I expressly forbid such abominable Idolatrous Sacrifices. They are as contrary to the Original Dictates of Humanity, as to all the Principles of reveal'd Religion. No Human institution could legitimate a Worship, in it self Idolatrous, and opposite to the goodness and Sovereignty of the supream Being.

The other Instance pleaded by the Author of the Apology was the Feast of the *Dedication* of the *Temple*, at which our *Saviour* was present; and this had no other Original than Human Institution. But the *Vindicator* says, that at the Feast of *Dedication*, our *Saviour* walked in the *Temple*

ple. But this cannot be strained (says he) to signifie either *joyning* or *Approbation*.

There is no straining in the case, when we say, that our *Saviour* was in the *Temple*, at the Feast of the *Dedication*, who never separated from the Publick Worship of the *Jews*. And was there a more proper Occasion to reprove *Festivities* appointed by Human Authority, than when he himself was present in the *Temple*, at the Feast of the *Dedication*.

But the *Vindicator* thought he went thither only to *walk*. This bold and irreligious fancy will vanish, when we call to mind, that our *Saviour* quarell'd nothing in the whole *Jewish* Constitution, meerly because it owed its beginning to Humane Appointment; and he himself complied with such usages amongst them, in the worship of God. So he eat the Paschal Lamb, not according to the Original Institution, *with their Loins girt, and shod in Shoes* Exod. 12. 12. *on their Feet, with staves in their Hands*, but leaning, as the Custom then was in our *Saviour's* Days. And this is so much the more observable, that there is nothing in the Original Precept, that gives the least hint of its being Temporary and transient, or relative to their Itinerary State in the Wilderness, but rather that it was of perpetual Force and

N 2 Oliga-

Obligation; yet the Church changed that *ritual* of Divine institution, in the celebration of the Paschal Lamb into another, which signified more properly Rest, and Possession of the Land of *Canaan*, as the other did, their Travelling and unsettled state and condition.

The *Jewish Post-cæniæ* of Bread and Wine after the Paschal Lamb, was founded upon no Divine Institution; yet our *Saviour* not only complied with it, but adopted it unto his own Religion, and gave it higher Significations, and established it for ever, a federal Rite of the New Covenant, to convey unto us the graces of his Holy Spirit, and the saving effects of his Sacrifice and Intercession. This I suppose, sufficiently proves by the by, the vanity of Presbyterian Speculations, concerning significant Rites and Ceremonies; and by proportion, that our *Saviour* would not find fault with Earthly Governors, if by their Authority, some solemn Portions of our time were set apart for the Publick Worship of God, as the Anniversary Feast of the *Dedication* was, by *Judas Maccabæus*, in memory of their having purged the *Temple* from the Profanations of *Antiochus*.

Vid. Dr. Falkner's *Libert. Eccles.* p. 194.

I am not at leisure to follow the *Vindicator* every where, far less am I inclin'd to

to examine all his Exceptions against the Author of the Apology; he endeavours to represent him not only as superstitious, but as Raving and Mad. He cites the following words from his Adversary: *It is certain, that nothing preserveth the knowledge of Christian Religion amongst the body of the People, more than the Festivities of the Church.* What! replies the *Vindicator*, *not the Word and Sacraments?* Whether this looketh rather like raving than like disputing, let the Reader judge.

If the Author of the Apology had asserted that the Christian *Festivities*, and Fasts might be duly and Religiously celebrated without the Word and Sacraments, and had magnified their Efficacy in that separated notion; the *Vindicator* might run out unto such Tragical complaints: But I am of the Opinion, that all Christians look upon the Festivities of the Church, as the fittest seasons for Christian Exercises; and it is not possible to have any notion of Christian Festivities without the Word and Sacraments. Are they not Originally designed to make us Thirst and Hunger after Righteousness, to quicken all the Graces of the Spirit, to make us hear the word of God with greater attention, and to receive the Sacraments with all Devotion and Humility; *subordinata non pugnans*. Christian Festivities

are observed for the sake of the Word and Sacraments, and therefore, if they promote the knowledge of the Christian Religion, it is because the Word of God is Preached, and the Sacraments administered with greater Zeal and Unanimity than at other Seasons; and here I think there is no *Raving* at all, but the words of Truth and Soberness.

If one should say to his Neighbour, there is nothing can preserve your Health more than to keep *good hours*, and to live in the clear and open Air; but he to whom he gives this Advice, returns upon him with great indignation and says, What? No, not good and wholesome Nourishment and warm Cloathing? His Friend doubtless would admire his Wit and Accuteness; but in the mean time would tell him, that when he recommended to him to keep *good hours*, he intended nothing else, but that all the Actions of his Life should be performed in their proper and convenient Seasons, and that he should Eat and Drink only when his Appetite prompted him, and not at other times; and if he understood *good hours*, without any regard to the employment of Life, he mistook his meaning, and the signification of that word in ordinary Conversation; for to keep *good hours*

hours is no more than to adjust the Actions of our Life to their most convenient Seasons, for there is a time for every thing under the Sun.

Who ever thought that the Christian Festivities had any tendency to promote Religion, without their proper and essential Exercises? Such times, (if only the Idea of time occur to your mind) cannot be more Holy than other times. But they are called *Holy-days* by a *relative* and *extrinsic* Denomination, because of the Holy exercises that are appointed to be performed on such Days, with the greatest Vigour and Solemnity; for one Day is not more holy than another. We must not think that when the Sun is in such a Sign of the *Zodiac*, that *of en* time is more Holy than in the former Sign; but such a time being separated for such an exercise, receives its denomination from the Authority and Exercise it self, by which it is distinguished from other times. And to think of Christian Festivities without their proper Exercises, (for which they have been appointed, and to which they are necessarily related) is no other in my humble Opinion, than to consider *unum relatam qua relatam sine aliqua habitudine ad alterum correlatum*, which I think is in it self absolutely im-

possible. And if the *Vindicator* imagines that Festivities are thought by his Adversaries to promote Religion, without the Word and Sacraments; he mistakes the plain Language of those he disputes against: I do not say, that he Raves; for Gross Ignorance, and Raving, are two different things. The Christian Festivities cannot be understood, nor thought of, without their immediate Relation to Christian Exercises, and are only valued upon this consideration, That *then* we apply our selves to all the exercises of Devotion, with all possible Zeal and Solemnity. And if they are separated from such Exercises, they are Abominations in the sight of God, as the Sacrifices and Festivities of God's own Institution were, when irregularly performed.

If it be said, that notwithstanding of their first Christian Institution, such *Holy-days* are not employed as they were Originally intended; this proves indeed the Corruption of Humane Nature, and that our Appetite for Spiritual things is decayed, but not at all the unlawfulness or inexpediency of that Constitution, by which we are so solemnly put in mind of our best and highest Interest; else the consequence must be, that the Bible, Sacraments, Priesthood, and all Religious exercises,

exercifes, are inconvenient and unlawful, for they are every Day trampled upon, and expofed to Contempt and Derifion. Notwithftanding of all this, it cannot be denied but that many good Chriftians receive much Advantage and Increate of their Faith, Hope, and Charity, at fuch ſolemn Times as have been ſeparated from the beginning for our Spiritual Advantage.

Let us in the next place confider his Thoughts concerning the Antiquity of ſuch ſtated Feftivities and Fafts in the Chriftian Church. *Again we can prove, (ſays he,) by the Silence both of Scripture and of other Church-Hiſtory, that this Feftivity, viz. Chriſtmas) was not uſed for 300 years after Chriſt; and a notable confirmation of this Argument may be taken from the notice that is taken of Eaſter in theſe times, he ſhould have ſaid thoſe,) and not a word of Chriſtmas.*

Here is an Affertion and the Confirmation of it. Let me be allowed to examine them both, without any Raving. The Affertion is, that the Feftivity of Chriſtmas, (nay, nor any other Feftivity excepting Eaſter,) is not mentioned for 300 years after Chriſt.

To which I oppoſe in the firſt place, the Teſtimony of Origen, who vindicates

Contra. Cels.

Gal. 4. 10. from having any thing in it contrary to the Christian Feasts; but if there were no Christian Festivities in the Days of *Origen*, his explications had been ridiculous and unnecessary. Again he mentioneth the Feast of the Holy-Innocents as a thing then received into the Practice of the Church; and this Feast is but one of the *Concomitants* of the Nativity. And the Reader may observe that *Origen* flourished about the Year 230. This may be allowed to be about 70 Years older than the Period fixt by the *Vindicator*.

*Hom. 3. in
Matth.*

The next Witness I name is *Hippolytus*, the Disciple of *Irenæus*, as *Photius* witnesseth; and he flourished about the Year 220, and wrote Homilies in *Sanctam Theophaniam*, which *Lucas Holstenius* would have Published out of his MSS. if he had lived: So that in his Days *Christmas* was observed as well as *Easter* and *Pentecost*; and it may be that the se-

*Vid. ap. De Elif.
Cav. Hist. liter.
p. 71.*

cond Line in *Gruterus* his Ancient Inscription of the Works of *Hippolytus*, of which there remains nothing undefac'd, but the two last Syllables *NIAC*, may be thus supplied, $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\ \pi\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\hat{\iota}\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\phi\alpha$ *NIAC*. I am not fond of this, further then to leave it as a Conjecture. It is enough that he wrote a Homily in *Theophaniam*, which

can

can be meant of no other Holy-Day, but that of the Nativity.

Again, I may be allowed to cite the apostolical Constitutions, which I do not pretend to have been written by any of the Apostles, or by *S. Clement* himself; or yet to have escaped the gross Interpolations of later hands: Nevertheless, it is acknowledged by all to be a most ancient Book, and to contain several strokes of Apostolical Simplicity and Piety. The Testimonies of the Ancients concerning this Work may be seen at length in *Cotelerius*. However, in the 5th Book, Chap. 13. the observation of the Festivity of Christ's Birth is enjoyed: and this may reasonably be supposed to be older than either *Hippolytus* or *Origen*, towards the middle, or end of the Second Century. Thus we find the Nativity of our *Saviour* so early Celebrated in the Christian Church. And since all acknowledge that *East. r* and *Pentecost* have been observed from the beginning, why may not we reasonably suppose, that the Mystery of his Nativity was held in equal Veneration? Thus we find the *Predicator* wrong in his Calculations concerning Christmas.

No less does he mistake the Christian Practice, as to other Holy-Days. Besides those

Edit. Cotelr.
p.1026.

those that he himself names from the *Centuriators*, let him in the first place read the Martyrdom of *S. Polycarp*, mean the famous Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna*, concerning their Bishop, and there he will find it was the Practice of the Christians, yearly to convene in the very Place where they laid his Precious Bones, to Celebrate the day of his Martyrdom, partly in remembrance of them who had gloriously resisted unto blood, and partly for the Exercise of following Generations. *S. Polycarp* was the Disciple of *S. John* the Apostle; so we find the Anniversary Commemorations of the Martyr celebrated so near to the days of the Apostles, even by their immediate Successors. And the Martyrdom of *S. Ignatius*, Published by Bishop *Usher*, mentions the same Practice of those who were Witnesses of the Death and Sufferings of *S. Ignatius*. And this also is the sense of *Tertullian*, *pro natalitiis (Martyrum) annu- die facimus (viz. oblationes)*

Vid. Acta
Martyrii S.
Ignat. ap.
Usher.

D^e corona mili-
tis, Cap.3.

Now if the Anniversary Commemoration of the *Martyrs* was so early as the days of *S. Ignatius* and *S. Polycarp*, the two Disciples of *S. John* the Apostle, the *Vindicator* will acknowledge that he is once mistaken in his Calculations of the Christian Festivities: for not only the

Christma

Christmas Holy-Days, but the *natalitia*
Martyrum are much older than he thought.
 and it is much safer to search the Original
 Monuments, than at all times to trust
 the *Centuriators*, whose Collections in-
 deed have been very useful, yet not so
 accurate and exact as to supersede all
 farther Enquiry. Several Genuine Re-
 cords of Ecclesiastical Antiquity are, by
 the great diligence of the last Age, now
 made Publick, that the *Centuriators* ne-
 ver saw. It is needless to Illustrate this
 historical Truth from the Testimonies of
 the succeeding Fathers, who yet are much
 older witnesses of Anniversary Days
 than the Period allowed by the *Vindica-* Epist. 34.
tor; particularly *S. Cyprian*, he is so Ex-
 press for the yearly Commemoration of
 the Martyrs. If the first Christians did
 commemorate the Martyrdom of the
 successors of the Apostles, it may be rea-
 sonably presumed they could not forget
 the Apostles themselves, who were the
 first and most Glorious *Combatants* in
 that Warfare. Thus we see, that the
 Festival of the Nativity, and other Holy-
 Days are mentioned by Authors so near
 the days of the First Witnesses of Christi-
 nity. So much I have said in Oppositi-
 on to the Forwardness of our *Vindicator*,
 who asserts, that such Holy-Days were
 not

not mentioned for the first three hundred Years.

His Assertion being thus disproved, his Confirmation falls to the Ground. When the first is found to be a Mistake, the other proves to be but a very useless Engine. And though the Festival of the Nativity had not been mentioned so oft as that of *Easter*, yet there are very good Reasons for this Silence: the Contentions about the time of Celebrating *Easter*, occasioned its being more frequently in their Writings. We meet with the Solemnities of *Easter* and *Pentecost* in the most ancient Records of the Christian Church, and therefore we may reasonably presume, that the other Festivals of our *Saviour's* Nativity, and those that do attend upon it, have had the same Original, and are kept in the Church by Immemorial Possession. This I think a more Easie and Natural Consequence, than that which our *Vindicator* would advance from the pretended silence of the Ancients.

Apol. p. 39.

The next Assault against the Author of the Apology is, That he affirmed, that the Church (when she appointed the 25th of *December* to Commemorate our *Saviour's* Nativity) did not decide that *Chronological* Nicety, whether our

Saviour

Saviour was born on the 25th of *December*, or not. As far as I understand his meaning, he is still of the same Opinion: and I believe he needs not change his former Sentiments; for all the Christians that are now in the World, (except the *Vindicator* and some few of his Friends) are agreed, that it was not necessary to determine in that Question; and they are satisfied that they Celebrate the Nativity according to the Intention of the Church, though they cannot Positively affirm, that at all times they hit the true Calculations; for these vary in several Countrys: and yet without Scruple they comply with the *Chronological* Accounts of that Country in which they Live. We do not hear that the *French*, (amongst whom the *Gregorian* Calendar obtains) blame the Christians in *England*, because they Celebrate the Nativity here later than they do. The Church in this Constitution, principally aimed at the Commemoration of the Mystery, and did not at all impose upon the Belief of her Sons and Daughters any thing, in matter of *Fact*, that was in it self Disputable.

The *Vindicator* left this Consideration altogether untouch'd. It was more the Business of the Church to Commemorate
the

the Nativity of our Blessed *Saviour*, that to fix the time when he was born. This is no new Fancy, as the *Vindicator* may be apt to imagine. 'Tis the Doctrin of no less Man than *S. Austin*; *Nos & Dominicam diem & Pascha solenniter celebramus, & alias dierum celebritates; sequia intelligimus quo pertineant, non tempora observamus, sed quæ illis significantur temporibus.* But I think it will be very difficult for the *Vindicator* to disprove the common Tradition, That our *Saviour* was born on the 25th of *December*.

Contra Adimant. Cap. 16.

Def. Vin. p. 29.

He blames the Author of the Apology that he Pleaded not for the Observation of Holy-Days with that Cogency of Argument and Reason that Doctor *Hooker* did. In this we are fully agreed; for I am apt to believe that he could never come up, no not in one single Instance and in the height of his strength, to the meanest of Doctor *Hooker's* Performances: yet he ought to do what he can to serve the Church, according to his Capacity, against those Late and New Opinions that oppress both Truth and Innocence.

Ibid.

The Author of the Apology, pleaded that the *Authority* of the Apostles and their Successors was a sufficient warrant for the Celebration of such Festivals to
the

the end of the World. Here (saith the *Vindicator*) is shuffling with a Witness, because the Apostles and their Successors are confusedly put together. Therefore it is but Just to Explain what he thinks is Dark and Obscure : for there is no more meant than that the Church may, by that Power which is Perpetually lodg'd in her, Regulate the Publick Solemnities of Worship ; and when she Enjoyns nothing but what is Lawful, we ought to obey: The Apostles made several Constitutions relating to Uniformity and Ecclesiastical Order that are laid aside by their Successors, and other Usages came in their room. Such Constitutions are in their nature variable, unless they are equally subservient to the great Ends of Discipline in all Ages and Countries; *Et nisi consuetudine Ecclesie Universae roborata sint*. In that case they ought to be removed by no less Authority than that to which they owe their Original Establishment. As for lesser Usages, their Continuance or Abrogation may depend upon the Convenience of Particular Churches. The Apostolical *Deaconesses* are no more in the Presbyterian Meetings, than in any of the Reformed Churches.

Ibid.

The *Vindicator* is not yet satisfied ; for he tells us, that *it is pleasant to observe, that our Learned Apologist is forced to use the same Argument for Christmas, that the Papists use for the blind Obedience to all that their Church enjoyneth.*

I heartily forgive him his *Ironical* and *Sarcastic* Jest. In the mean time, the Author of the Apology was not forced to use any other Argument than such as he pleased himself : and he thinks that he may plead for Obedience to our Lawful Governors in things that are Lawful in their own Nature ; and such Constitutions that regulate the Publick Solemnities of Worship, may easily be distinguished from the Arbitrary imposing upon our Faith, such Articles as were never revealed by our *Saviour* or his Apostles, which is the Popish Practice. To Enjoyn the First is Reasonable and Advantageous to the Ends of Piety and Devotion : to impose the Last is more than our Governors dare Justly pretend to ; so he pleaded not for a Blind Obedience, but for a Reasonable Subordination, without which all Humane Societies must crumble into pieces.

Def. Vind. p. 29,
39.

The *Vindicator* is, in the next Place, highly Incensed, that his Citation from *S. Austin* is no more regarded ; but that

it is said to be Nonsense. He may be very sure, that if the Author of the Apology thought that *S. Austin* had made use of any such Expression, in the sense intended by the *Vindicator*, he had treated it with greater Deference: But to be very plain, he is of Opinion, that there is nothing in all the Works of *S. Austin*, that can be distorted to serve the *Vindicator's* design in this Particular. If he had been so Favourable and Kind, he might have told us, where such a Sentence might be found; and then we might easily see, whether there were any such words made use of by *S. Austin* that could be reconciled to the *Vindicator's* Hypothesis. To cite two or three words from the several large Volumes of *S. Austin*, without telling us where they may be found, is, to leave us in a vast Desert without a Guide: and it is not very probable that there is any thing to be met with in his Works against the Lawfulness of keeping Anniversary Holy-Days, since he himself derives those Customs that Universally prevailed in the Church, from no lower Cause than Apostolical Authority. However, when the *Vindicator* leads us to the Place where those Expressions are to be met with, and offers any probable Reason, that they ought to be

be understood in his Sense, they shall then be considered.

Def. Vind. p. 30.

Again, the *Vindicator* says, *it is not a day being Anniversary (as he dreameth, viz. the Author of the Apology) that is the ground of our Scruple: for we do not disallow Anniversary Days for any civil Work or Solemnity; but that men should separate, by their own Authority, one day of the Year from the rest, by sequestering it from civil use (for which the Lord hath allowed us all the six days in the Week) and dedicating it to Religious Employment, we think this belongeth to God alone.*

The Quarrel then against such Days is not their being Anniversary, for if we thought so formerly we were but *Dreaming*. We are now assured by the *Vindicator* that this is not the ground of their *Scruple*. And the truth is, after all his Illuminations, we are still left in the Dark where to find it: but if ever we thought that such days being Anniversary was the Ground of it, we mistook it widely; for they allow Anniversary days for any civil Work or Solemnity: but to Separate a day for Religious Exercises, this belongeth to God alone, as he seems to infer from the Fourth Commandment.

The Debate then is not concerning their being Anniversary Days, nor their being separated

separated for Religious Exercises : for upon Occasions some Days may be appointed by Humane Authority for such ; but the great danger is, if they should be separated from civil Use, and Dedicated to Religious Employment, and by Humane Authority to return every Year.

Die Quintiliane colorem.

The Author of the Apology was Rash and Precipitate : He has brought an old House upon his head. He ventured to disclose Mysteries that Humane Eyes cannot pierce into. Authority may Separate a Day upon occasion of some extraordinary Mercies or Judgments that concern one Nation, City, or Family, notwithstanding of any Insinuation that may lie against it in the bosom of the Fourth Commandment ; then by necessary Consequence, the Separating any part of our time, by Humane Authority, from Civil to Religious Exercises, is no Breach of the Fourth Commandment ; and it is not possible for him to invent another reason, why Religious Solemnities may be quarrelled but purely upon the account of their being Anniversary. And if, for lesser Mercies that concern one City or Family, we may Separate so much of our time to the immediate honour of God, why may not those Mercies, that

concern Mankind in general, all Generations, Tongues, Kindreds, and Nations, deserve an Annual, or Anniversary Commemoration? Why the one is allowed and the other forbidden, I desire to know from the Fourth, or any other Commandment. So it seems in their Opinion, the words in the fourth Commandment may allow a day now and then to be set apart for Religious Exercises, if the occasions were never so frequent. But if they recur Yearly upon us, that is *forbidden* in the fourth Commandment. Yet the fault is *not in their being Anniversary*. I do not say that this is *raving*, but certainly here are extraordinary Speculations, and far above the reach of ordinary Mortals to comprehend.

The next words cited from the Author of the Apology, are such as one would have thought deserve no great Censure, *viz.* that *it is very dangerous to separate from the Church in those Constitutions and Solemnities that have been derived from the Apostles or Apostolic times.* To which the *Vindicator* replies, that *the Reader will Judge whether any one word of this Thra-sonic triumph be true, or have sufficient foundation in what he hath proved.*

One great Misfortune is in our present Engagement, that we are not likely to under-

understand one another. For hitherto I thought that to be *Thrasonical* in Words and Actions signified a Toppish kind of Vanity, when a Man admires himself, and applauds his own Wit and Performances, to the disparagement of better Men or his Equals; and vents upon every occasion such fulsom Conceits of himself as makes him Ridiculous. But here the Apologist is represented as in a *Thrasonic Triumph*, because of his Deference and Regard to those Usages and Constitutions that have Universally prevailed in the Christian Church. If we do not understand one another, it is in vain to reason. I pretend that there is nothing *Thrasonical* in that Deference that is justly due to the wisdom of so many Nations and Ages. But he is of another Opinion, and therefore I think that he ought in the first place to write a *Dictionary* and send me a Copy of it, that we may know what such and such words do signifie in his *Dialect*, else we may beat the Air at this rate as long as we live, and very little to our Satisfaction and Edification.

The next Assault may be endured more easily, for he only upbraids him with the weakness of his Intellectuals and illogical stumblings, it is this *he* (the Apologist) *telleth us, (but I know not to what purpose,)*

that the knowledge of Christ doth not extinguish the light of Reason, therefore such Constitutions, (as the Reason of all Mankind is agreed in) have nothing in them contrary to the Purity of our Religion. *These are such loose Arguings, (saith the Vindicator) of which the meanest Logician might be ashamed.*

If I understand the Apologist right, his meaning is this, that no Society of Mankind either Jewish, Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan, ever thought *Anniversary* Religious Solemnities unlawful, thò established only by Humane Authority ; but on the contrary, that all of them judged such very proper to preserve and excite in the People all Devotion and Obedience. There was nothing in the Light of Nature against them : The Seasons of them were regulated by Humane Prudence. They were forbidden neither by *Moses*, nor our blessed *Saviour*; their Lawfulness is only questioned in these last Days, by some few, who cannot reasonably be thought wiser or better than the rest of Mankind, and therefore (saith the Apologist) Men had better comply with such Constitutions, than raise such a clamour as destroys all Unity and Order about things not only innocent, but useful in their Nature and Tendency.

I am willing to be informed where the Flaw of this reasoning lies. Whatever is agreeable to true Reason, is rather improved than condemn'd by Religion; but such Constitutions are agreeable to true Reason: *ergo*, there is nothing in them contrary to the Purity of our Religion. This *Syllogism* (I suppose) is right enough for the *form*, if we can defend the several *propositions in it*. The first I think is evident; for God never set up two Lights, the one to extinguish the other, but rather the latter, to exalt and advance the former; tho' we know by the Gospel several Mysteries that unassisted Reason would never penetrate into; yet the Principles of Reason are still the same that they were, before Revelation did illuminate it. And there is nothing in Revelation that overthrows the Principles of Reason, nay, it teaches us to Reason better, and without the true exercise of Reason, we are not capable of the Advantages of Revelation; for all its Superstructures presuppose our being reasonable Creatures: And when our *Saviour* brought the last and most perfect Revelation into the World, there was no necessity to inform Mankind, that they must needs appoint Anniversary Solemnities, to increase and preserve the Reverence due to Christiani-
ty;

ty; for all Nations of whatever Religion were already agreed, that such Constitutions were the ordinary *Concomitants* of Religion, as publickly profess'd. And why should not the true Religion have as many expressions of our Love and Reverence, as any other Institution?

As for the second Proposition, that such Constitutions are agreeable to true Reason; all Nations have Agreed in this, and this is the best Evidence of what is agreeable to true Reason; and it is no objection in *Law* against the Universality of their Consent, that some few Individuals in our Days pretend, that the rest of Mankind have been mistaken; for it is a *maxim* in the Civil-law; *quod major pars curie efficit pro eo habetur acsi omnes egerint*. And again,, *refertur ad universos quod publice fit per majorem partem*. So that when we meet with any thing that hath been equally received amongst all Nations, and in all Religions, we may be allowed to think that such a Constitution in it self was agreeable to Humane Reason: (I speak of such Constitutions in their general and abstracted Nature, separated from the particular *ends* and *objects* of different Religions, which may be good or bad, as the Religion is,) the Jews and the Christians have equally agreed in
this,

L. 19. ff. ad
Municip.

L. 160. f. de re-
gulis Juris.

this, and therefore a *primo ad ultimum*, there is nothing in such Constitutions unagreeable to Humane Reason, and consequently nothing prejudicial to true Religion.

But the *Vindicator* hath something more to add. *We do not deny* (saith he,) *the use of Reason in Religion* — but that *the use of Reason is to appoint New Ordinances, or means of Grace, that Christ hath not appointed, we deny.*

But hath any of his Adversaries affirmed that Men, by the light of Reason, without any Revelation, might appoint New Ordinances and New Means of Grace, that Christ hath not appointed? The Anniversary Holy-days were never intended to introduce into the Church New Ordinances and Means of Grace, but have been appointed rather to encrease our Devotion for the old *ones*, that are acknowledged by all Christians to have been instituted by our Saviour: When I receive the *Eucharist* upon Christmas-day, I never thought of a new Mean of Grace different from that appointed by our Saviour. Such a Day I go to Church, and the whole time is spent in Prayers, Praises, and *Eucharistical* Sacrifices; but the *new* means of Grace and *new* Ordinances I cannot see. The publick Seasons, and Anniversary solemnities,

nities put me in mind of the Mysteries of my Redemption. I apply my self to the Federal Rites of God's Institution, by which the Graces of his Spirit are conveyed and revived. Where then are the *new* means of Grace that Christ hath not appointed? The publick Seasons are nothing else than Circumstances of time which may well be regulated by Ecclesiastical Authority. It is a great misfortune to be taught to reproach and nickname the excellent Constitutions of the Church from their Infancy. Thus the *Separatists*, without any further examination, prosecute the Church by visionary and groundless Accusations; they cannot endure to hear of a Holy-day. Why? because they cannot allow that Men can appoint *new* means of Grace that Christ hath not appointed. This is strong natural Nonsense; no Art could match it: The Church regulates the publick Seasons and Solemnities of Religion; *ergo*, she appoints *new* Means of Grace that Christ hath not appointed; there are no such *ergo's* in the case. The Consequence is this, that she appoints her Children to approach her Altars at such and such Seasons, and partake of the *old* Means of Grace appointed by our Saviour, with all possible Zeal, Decency, and Unanimity.

Howe

However, the *Vindicator* hath something more to say, and after many harsh Compliments bestowed upon the Apologist, he comes at length to this, *Our Argument hath yet greater strength, if we consider not only that the Holy-day now debated about, (viz Christmas) was kept by the Heathens in Honour of Julius Cæsar, and hence called Yule in Scotland.*

Def. vind. p. 31.

The longer a Man lives, the more opportunities he hath to learn something that is new, so ignorant have I been of this piece of *Roman* Antiquity. I never thought that *Christmas* was observed in honour of *Julius Cæsar*: Our *Saviour* was born in the Days of *Augustus*, and it is not probable that his *Nativity* was celebrated before he was born, or that *Julius Cæsar* was any *Type* of him, or that the Heathens ever observed this Festivity, or that there was any *Feast* observed in any place of the *World*, to the Honour of *Julius Cæsar*. Sometime ago we might be allowed to smile, if we heard any such thing; but now after six Years oppression, our *Animal Spirits* move so heavily, that nothing can put them in a brisker Motion.

Yet this odd piece of *History* is proved sufficiently by the *Vindicator*; for (says he) it is called *Yule* in *Scotland*.

Many

Many of our Words in *Scotland*, (if I may be permitted to inform one that may know it better than my self) are but French Words Corrupted, which may be done by the changè or Addition of one Letter; and the word (*Yuel*) is but *Noel*, and this again but the contraction of *Nouvelles*, so that *le jour de Noel* is nothing else than the Day of Tidings, first published by the Shepherds which brought Joy to all Nations.

And this Historical Solæcism (as far as I can guess) seems to be built on *Buchanan's* Authority, not well considered; for speaking of the *British* King *Arthur*, and his Victories against the *Saxons*, he tells us that when he came to *York*, the Town was Surrendered unto him, and towards the end of *December*, the *Nobility* that came to *Court* spent their time in all Excess and Riot, so that *renata est* (saith *Buchanan*) *veterum Saturnaliorum imago*; the ancient *Saturnalia* seemed to be revived, and the whole Scene looked rather like the *Pagan* Solemnity of *Saturn*, then the Commemoration of our *Saviours* Nativity. This informs us, what their Practice was, and not what it ought to be, which became the more abominable, that they committed such Follies when they were obliged in those Seasons to be better employed. He

*Buch. lib. 5
hist.*

He adds, *Nostri (Julia) id festum vocant, Caesaris (viz) nomine pro Saturno substituto*, so he thought that they should rather call that Festivity by the Name of *Saturnalia*, than *Julia*; but he mistook it; for the People by that Word had no regard to *Julius Caesar*, nor did they call it *Julia*, (for they spoke no Latin) but *Yuel*, which I have accounted for already.

If our Author had read the place in *Buchanan*, he would not have said that *Christmas* was observed in honour of *Julius Caesar*; for his design was to shew how inconsistent their Debaucheries were to the Ecclesiastical Institution; and that by their Lust and Riot, they sacrificed rather to *Saturn*, than celebrated the Nativity of our Saviour, which may be easily gathered from the words that immediately follow, *vulgo persuasum est, natalem Christi iis ceremoniis coli, qua in re verius Bacchanaliorum lasciviam quam Christum nati memoriam referri, satis constat.* Now which of the three will he say, that *Christmas* was appointed to honour? *Saturn*, *Julius Caesar*, or *Bacchus*; for *Buchanan* speaks of all the three; but withal adds, that the common People thought the Nativity of our Saviour was honoured by such Ceremonies. They certainly
little

little understood the Nature and Tendency of Christian Religion, if they pretended to honour our *Saviour* by breaking of his **Laws** ; and therefore the Historian thought, that the Name of *Saturnalia*, or *Bacchanalia*, belonged rather to those Feasts, when they were attended with such enormous Practices, than the *Natalitia Domini*. And so far he was in the right, if, instead of minding the Holy exercises intended by the Church, Men give themselves over to all Lasciviousness and disorder.

When our Country-man wrote his History, he was very apt to blame the Church for every scandalous Fault that appeared among the Christians. But Satyr is not the way to reclaim Mankind ; the Purity of his Phrase could not hide the Bitterness of his Temper. When we consider his Invectives against *Queen Mary*, they may be compared, for Stile and Contrivance, to the most celebrated Remains of Antiquity, but for Spite and ill nature to the highest order of Devils.

Towards the middle of this page, the *Vindicator* gathers together a great many expressions from the Author of the Apology, wherein he bestowes great *Elogies* on the Festivities of the Church ; and therefore the *Vindicator* thinks, that he

he equals them to the Word and Sacraments; *for indeed he (the Apologist) saith as much as Christmass, and other Holy-days are the Power of God unto Salvation.*

He does indeed look upon the Festivities and Fasts of the Church, as the publick and stated Seasons, wherein the Power of God unto Salvation, or the Word and Sacraments are displayed with all possible Advantages, to support our Faith, Hope, and Charity; this is not to make them equal to the Word and Sacraments, but rather subservient to them both.

But he (the Apologist) saith, that by the Consent of all Nations, such Solemnities are necessary to the Being and Beauty of Religion.

An ordinary Degree of good Nature would have passed over this without any Severity or Censure. Religion may be considered in a two fold Capacity, either with regard to the internal Exercise, or *Secondly*, the external Profession. To the first, it may be, such Solemnities are not absolutely necessary; to the second they may be very useful, as far as the Exercises of Religion must be performed, sometimes with Order, Uniformity, and Society.

But his Libel is not yet over; for he makes the Apologist *to damn them all to Hell, who do not observe Christmass.* It is not my way to give any Man the Lie, he may recollect himself a little, and then he must acknowledge that he never read any such thing in the Book that he pretends to refute, and therefore the Consequences that he draws from this vanish into Air and Imagination. As for the several other reformed Churches, that he says have no Anniversary Festivities, they are all of them in the World of the Moon, except Geneva, who yet hath one Day answerable to the fifth of November in Bri-

Le jour d'esca- **tain.** 'Tis true, when our Country is under the Eclipse of Presbytery, the Men of his Way endeavour to suppress the Observation of the Festivities; but they were never yet able, in the height of their Power, totally to abolish them.

lade.

C A A P.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Presbyterian Notion of Schism, and their fabulous Stories concerning their Ecclesiastical Parity in the first Ages of Christianity.

THE next thing that deserves Re-
proof, is their notion of Schism ;
I speak of it here as represented by their
Vindicator, who will not allow that the
Scots Presbyterians (generally speaking)
are Schismatics, tho' they have all the
marks, by which such may be distin-
guished from others, who worship God
in Unity and Society. There is nothing
of greater Consequence to the Edification
of the People than Christian Unity : this
is pathetically urged by the Holy Ghost,
and S. Paul declareth that the Discords
and Contentions of the *Corinthians* were
an Evidence of their being Carnal. And
it is certain, that Separation from any
Christian Church duly constituted, is then
only Lawful and Necessary, and free

Phil. 2. 1. 2.

Ephe. 2. 21, 22.

1 Cor. 3. 3.

from Schism, where Communion cannot be kept without Sin. It is needless to cite the Ancients to this purpose, who declare against Schism frequently and severely. *Dionysius Alexandrinus* thought that to suffer Martyrdom to preserve the Unity of the Church, is no less Glorious than to be a Martyr for refusing to offer Sacrifice unto *Idols*. And *S. Cyprian* asserts, That the Sin of breaking the Churches Peace by Schism is in divers respects more heinous than that of those *Lapsed* Christians, who, in the time of Persecution, offered Sacrifice to *Idols*. And again, that the Stain of it could not be removed by Martyrdom. By the word (*Schism*) is meant in the common Ecclesiastical Notion, those Unnecessary and Factious Separations, from any part of the Catholic Church, where we may hold Communion without breaking the Laws of God. For such a Separation is manifestly a Breach of our Baptismal Vows, by which we are United unto the whole body of Christians all the World over, and obliged to hold Communion with all the Faithful, and upon all occasions, where there is nothing imposed in it self Sinful.

If the Church that requires our Obedience, hath in its Worship Publick and Heretical

*Euseb. Hist.
Eccles. Lib 6.*

*De Unitate Ec-
clesiæ.*

Heretical Confessions, or if our Ecclesiastical Governors enjoyn us to believe any thing contrary to the Catholic Tradition of the Christian Church, or if the Worship it self be polluted with several things that are inconsistent with the Honour of God, the Purity and Simplicity of our Religion; in that case we ought to separate from a Church so defiled, that we may not be divided from Christ the Head and original Fountain of all true Peace and Unity.

The Author of the Apology offered *several Considerations to prove the Presbyterians of Scotland Schismatics.* Apol. p. 44. As first, that they separate from all other Churches in the World, as well as that to which they owe Obedience. That there is not now a Church upon Earth with whom they think they may communicate without fear of being Polluted.

The *Vindicator* says, *that this is false,* Def. Vind. p. 33. *for none of them refuse to communicate with the Churches of Holland, France, Geneva, &c. And thò there be in those Churches several things that they dislike, yet they thought it not Unlawful to communicate with them.*

The things (I suppose) that they disliked in *France* and *Holland* were their stinted Liturgies in the Publick Worship,

their Observation of the Christian Festivities and such like. For what they disliked in any of those Churches, he tells us, *they abstained from the Practice and Approbation of it.*

At this rate it will be difficult to find Schismatics in all the Records of the Church. We cannot be said to be Members of a particular Church, or to hold Communion with it, if we do not joyn in their Worship, as it is established amongst them. The Publick Worship in the Churches of *Holland*, (at least the more Solemn parts of it,) is fix'd and Liturgical. I suppose the Presbyterians forbore the Practice of this, and could not approve it; yet he says, they *cheerfully communicated with the Churches of Holland*. The Churches of *France* and *Holland* both observe the great Festivities. Does he know any Presbyterian that received the Sacrament upon such Festivities? No sure. They would keep at a distance from such Heathenish and Superstitious Observances. And at the rate that he explains his Communion with the Churches of *Holland*, there is not a Church upon Earth with which he may not Communicate. For since he forbears the Practice of those things that he dislikes, why may not he be said to hold

hold Communion with all visible Churches upon Earth: for he cannot deny but that there are very many Excellent things amongst them; and he may only forbear the things he does not love. He could Communicate with the Protestant Churches of *France* tho' they retained the Christian Festivities, which (in his Sense) are humane Ordinances and new Means of Grace that Christ hath not appointed. And if there be many things in the *Roman Church* that are unexcusable, it is but his forbearing the Practice of them. In a word, they can communicate with any Church, and hold Christian Fellowship with no Church. It is true, the first Presbyterians never scrupled the Communion of the *Dutch* or *French* Protestants, no nor the Communion of the Episcopal Church of *Scotland*. Their Objections then against *Episcopacy*, *Liturgies*, and *Festivities*, were but Soft and Raw, they are now grown up to a terrible and Gigantic stature. They must no more come near a Liturgy, than they would Sacrifice their Children in the Valley of the Son of *Hinnom*.

He grants that the Presbyterians formerly used the *Doxology*; but he knows no warrant for the constant use of it — That seems to be too great Desirence to humane

D. f. Wind.
P. 33, 34

Composure, therefore they think it better to lay it aside.

And not only to lay it aside, but to turn out the Episcopal Clergy out of their Livings, if they presume to retain it in the Publick Worship, according to the ancient Custom of the Church. This is Insolence and Impiety with a witness.

He knows no Warrant for the constant use of it; But he knows very good Warrants for the constant Use of Extemporary Prayer in the Publick Worship.

I would ask the *Vindicator*, why he thinks that the *Doxology* can be said to be more a Humane Composure, than the Psalms which now they sing in their Churches. The matter of the one is as *Orthodox* and *Unquestionable* as the other: and the Metre in which the Psalms are Sung, is as much a Humane Composure as the other can be. The Confession of our Faith in the Holy *Trinity*, is as much Scripture and Revelation as any of the Psalms of *David*.

But this is a Digression, and upon the former Consideration I affirm, That our Presbyterians are Schismatics in the strictest Notion; because they cannot keep the Communion of any of the Reformed Churches, who all of them have fix'd and established Liturgies, and retain the great Christian Festivities. It is true,

Geneve hath no *Festivals*. And I acknowledge it was a mistake in the Author of the Apology to say that they had any such. But upon the whole matter, our Presbyterians cannot be said to hold Communion with the Protestant Churches abroad, because of their *stinted* Forms and *Humane* Ordinances, *Organs*, Significant Rites and Ceremonies: all which are so twisted with the Solemnities of their Worship, that since the Presbyterians cannot approve of these, they must not be supposed to hold Communion with the Foreign Churches. *Apol. p. 44.*

A second Consideration proposed by the Apologist to prove them Schismatics is this, That if the present Presbyterians had lived one hundred and fifty Years before the first Council of *Nice*, there was then a Necessity (by their Principles) to Separate from the Unity of the Church. *Apol. p. 46.*

Here (says the *Vindicator*) there is a large Field for Disputation. He denies that the *Hierarchy* was then in the Church: however some of the names might be; yet the thing now signified by those names was not then in being.

Amongst the things that oblige them to separate from the Unity of the Church they reckon Anniversary Festivities, significant

nificant Ceremonies, the sign of the Cross, &c. And does he think that these and such like were not then received into the Christian Church? I beseech him to read some of the Ancient Monuments of the Church. It were enough to make any Man ridiculous to prove things that are so evident in Ecclesiastical History. The Commemoration of *Martyrs*, the Observation of *Easter*, are much older than the Period named by the Apologist. And it is a demonstration of their being Schismatics in the notion of the Catholic Church, That they would have been obliged to have separated from the Communion of Christ's Visible Church, in the First and Purest Ages.

A third Consideration makes them Schismatics, because such Practices as they are now guilty of, were Condemned as Schismatical by their *own* Predecessors. He tells us, that this was formerly answered by him, but leaves us to guess where it may be found; and so I let it alone.

Apol. p. 46.

A fourth Consideration is this, that no Schismatics can be named in the Records of Ecclesiastical History, to whom that Name is more agreeable than to the Presbyterians of *Scotland*.

To this is answered, that the *Donatists* Def. Vind. p. 34. separated from the Church because she admitted the Lapsed on their Repentance, and cast off their Lawful Pastors, and all Communion with the Church: but we do not cast off all Communion with the Church, or reject we our Pastors, but cleave to them, rather than to Intruders. These last, no doubt, are the Episcopal Clergy, who were but of yesterday in comparison of the Presbyterians, whose names are so often mentioned in the most ancient Histories, Records, and General Councils.

The account that he gives us of the *Donatists*, is wholly his own, and borrowed from no Author at all. The original Crime of the *Donatists* was this, that at *Carthage*, they erected an Altar against the true Altar, and ordained *Maj-
orinus* Bishop in that See where *Cecilian* was Duly and Canonically Elected. This Optat. Milevitan. cum notis Albaspin, Paris 1679. Irregular and Tumultuous Ordination was promoted chiefly by *Lucilla* a Spanish Lady, who had corrupted, by her Presents and Flattery *Secundus* Primate of *Numidia*, and several other Clergy-Men, that they might Factiously advance *Majorinus*, who was her Domestic, into the room of *Cecilian*. Being so far engaged in their Schismatical Impiety, they afterwards invented Crimes against *Cecilian*, and

and those that Ordain'd him, as if they had been *Traditors*. This Faction at length grew strong, and took its name from *Donatus* (not him *a casis nigris*, but another) a Man of great Heat and Eloquence. And thô they were frequently Condemn'd upon full hearing, both by the *Ecclesiastical* and *Imperial* Authority, in *France*, *Afric*, and *Italy*; yet their Obstinacy was Irreclaimable, and they continued in their wilful Separation, notwithstanding that the whole Catholic Church communicated with *Cecilian*, and his Successors in the *See of Carthage*.

If our Author was in Earnest, he ought to have named Schismatics in the Ancient Church, whose Pleas, when represented with all possible Advantage are not so Fair and Plausible as those acknowledged by the Presbyterians; instead of this, he telleth us, that the *Donatists* forsok their Lawful Pastors. And is not this the very Crime that is charged on the Presbyterians, that they erect Altar against Altar, and gather Churches out of those that are already constituted. And thô the *Donatists* refused the Communion of *Cecilian*, yet they always had amongst themselves *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*: but our Presbyterians have thrown out of the Church the first and
last

ast of these, by which Contempt, their cause cannot be so easily maintained, as that of the *Donatists*; and there is no doubt but that the *Donatists* would have paid much more for their Pastors, than our Adversaries can say for their own.

However he mistook the *Novatians* for the *Donatists*; for these, and not the *Donatists*, denied Repentance to the *Lapsi*, and the Truth is, our *Vindicator* is never more unfortunate than when he meddles with the Ancients.) The Bishops themselves were admitted to Repentance amongst the *Donatists* (a Practice altogether contrary to the Discipline of the Church.) The *Novatians* taught that the Church could pardon no Crimes; but the *Donatists* received into their Fellowship such as had gone through the several Steps of their publick Repentance. Again, the *Novatians* abstain'd from second Marriages, the other did not; and the only thing wherein they agreed, was the Name of *Puritan*, or *Cathari*: The first thought themselves pure, because they kept at a distance from the *Lapsi*; the other, because they would have nothing to do with *Cecilian* nor his Successors, in the See of *Carthage*. Upon the whole matter I desire to know what was, in the Opinion of the Catholic Church

Church, that made both of them Schismatics and whether it was not, That upon frivolous pretences they left the Communion of the Church, and erected Altar against Altar. I suppose there were many amongst the *Novatians*, better Men than any of the later Sectaries; yet, by overstretching the Ecclesiastical Discipline, unto too much rigour and severity, (inconsistent with Christian Compassion, and Human infirmity) they incurr'd the Censure of the Church, and the infamous Character of Schismatics: And I am still of the Opinion, that both *Novatians* and *Donatists* had more plausible Pleas for their separation, than any that ever the Presbyterians made use of.

A fifth reason to prove them Schismatics is founded on the Doctrine of S. *Cyprian*, but our Author says, that a *Bishop in Cyprian's time was not a Diocesan, but the Pastor of a Flock, or the Moderator of a Presbytery*; and a little after tells us, *That they disown the Bishops of Scotland, for being their Bishops.*

If S. *Cyprian* was a *Diocesan Bishop*, he allows himself and his Party to be truly Schismatics, and this is a plain demonstration that he is altogether unacquainted with the Works of S. *Cyprian*: He ought to remember that he makes the
Bishops,

Bishops, (as superiour to, and distinguished from Presbyters) the Successors of the Apostles; and in another place, that the Polity of the Church that then obtain'd, was established *Divinâ lege*. All Jurisdiction and Authority was then lodg'd in the Bishops, insomuch that Presbyters did not meddle with the special Acts of Jurisdiction belonging to him, so not when the *See* was vacant, as appears from the Epistle of the *Roman Presbyters*, upon the Death of *Fabianus*; in which they plainly insinuate, that they had no Authority as long as they wanted a Bishop; *post excessum nobilissima memoria viri Fabiani nondum est Episcopus &c. qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum qui lapsi sunt possit cum Auctoritate & consilio habere rationem.* So it seems that in those Days they had not the knack of choosing a *Moderator*, who to morrow is equal with his Brethren. And there is no doubt to be made, but that the *Presbyters* of *Rome* understood the Word (*Auctoritas*) in the sense of the *Roman Law*, by which the power of *Tutors* over *Pupils* was called *Authority*; and whatsoever was transacted without the Consent of *Guardians*, by *Pupils*, was said to be *nullo auctore gestum*.

*Tertul. de Bap-
tismo.*

All subordinate Ecclesiastics were to attempt nothing in the Government of the Church without the Authority of their Bishop, who, (as *Tertullian* witnesseth) could not so much as Baptize without his Licence. And I leave it to the Ingenuity of any Man alive, that hath read the genuine Works of *S. Cyprian*, whether they ever found the Episcopal Authority asserted more plainly; nay, so little did the orderly *Presbyters* of *Carthage* venture to meddle with Acts of Jurisdiction and Government, even in the absence of *S. Cyprian*, that they always consulted those Bishops which were then at *Carthage*, from other places of *Afric*, in the Exercise of Ecclesiastical Discipline. Which Deference to his *Colleagues* is highly commended by *S. Cyprian*; for none but Bishops were called his *Colleagues*.

Ep. 28.

But we are told *S. Cyprian* was no *Diocesan* Bishop; if he means that the word (Diocess) was not then applied to signify the Ecclesiastical *District* of a Bishop's Pastoral Inspection, such an Observation is nothing to the purpose; the City of *Carthage* and its *Territories* was a sufficient Diocess; the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and other Christians, there, were wholly under his Spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction, call it by what Name you please

please, the nature of the thing is not varied from what it was.

It remains therefore, that since our Adversaries keep the Communion of no Church, and that they bear in their Forehead the Original and fundamental Character of the Primitive Schismatics, in that they erect Altar against Altar, and that they have, by Violence, Tumult, and Sedition, thrust out of the Church, the Bishops, who, by their Office and Character, were the Centre of Unity, in the Primitive Ages, and that now they plead such reasons for their Separation, as their late Predecessors were unacquainted with. Upon these Considerations I say, they are not only Schismaticks in the Notion of *S. Cyprian*, but in the Sense of the whole Christian Church.

We are next informed by the *Vindica- Def Vind. p. 34.*
tor, that what he said, against the Clergy's Preaching *only* Morality was aimed at the *Writer* of that Book, that he pretends to refute, and *some others who are of his Kidney*.

Here I desire the Reader to take notice, that when his *second Vindication* appeared, in which he thus Censured the Clergy, he neither saw any Sermons of his Adversary in Print, nor did he himself ever hear him Preach. Yet at that time, with-

out any further knowledge, he intended that Censure against him, and such as he is pleased to call the *Men of his Kidney*. I see then what fair dealing I must expect from him.

Def. Vind. p. 35.
36.

Yet he is pleased to say, that his Adversary is very uncharitable, that he did not think, that his *decretum Præteritum* and *Prædamnatum* (though fairly Printed, and solemnly distinguished from other Words in *Italic* Letters, to fix the Reader's attention) was not the Printer's fault, rather than his. There are some mentioned in the Gospel, who *laid heavy Burthens on other Mens Shoulders, but they themselves would not touch them with one of their Fingers*. I am not concern'd what comes of his *decretum prædamnatum*, since he now disowns it, he shall never hear more of it from me. He allows himself to Censure those Discourses, that he never heard at a blind venture, meerly because they were Preached without the Walls of a Conventicle; but if we read the words as they are plainly Printed, then we must be uncharitable, and rejoyce in evil, because we do not immediately conclude that Presbyterians, especially their Leaders, are beyond the possibility of stumbling or Inadvertence. And tho' we read *Blasphemy* and *Nonsense*, yet we must

must blame the Printer, rather than presume to think the Author capable of such a mistake. Well! let the Printer be so great a Blockhead as he represents him, the sheets were corrected (as I am informed) by the Author; and if I was as uncharitable as he is pleased to represent his Adversary, I would require better Proof of his Innocence in this particular; let me only be permitted to tell him, that since he allows his Adversary no other Talent than that of *Declamation*, he may think that this Practice of his might be exposed more plausibly than now I am resolved to do. One Talent in an evil time is very considerable, if it be not laid up in a Napkin; sometime or other it may yield encrease. I wish the sense of Human infirmities may effectually teach him to be more Charitably inclined, and then he will certainly forbear so Magisterially to Censure either the Sermons or Morality of those, that he was never well acquainted with.

That which I am to examine in the next place is of greater Consequence. Our Author continues still in his former mistake and error; he will impose upon his Readers, that the first Christians amongst the *Scots*, were *Presbyterians*, about the end of the second, or beginning

D. f. Vind. p. 36.

of the third Century. If this hold, it is certainly a better Argument for Presbyterian Government, than the Practice of their first Reformers; for this last pretence is found to be a *Lie* in matter of *Fact*, and an *Impertinence* in point of Reason. But if there was a Presbyterian Church in our Country so near the Apostolic times, then their *Tenure* is much more Authentick and Ancient, than the Authority of *Beza* and *Melvil*; therefore we ought, without any Tergiversation or shifting, to hear their pretences, and fairly examine their Arguments.

In the first place, the Reader may take notice, that this present Debate is *Questio Facti*, and therefore by the sense of all Mankind must be decided by Testimony, and by the relation of such Authors as might know the Truth of what they wrote themselves, or had it conveyed to them by competent Witnesses. And the Author of the Apology, from this general *Topic*, and some proper Amplifications, concluded, that we had no such Model in the Primitive times, and that there was no Historical evidence for any such Fabulous and Monkish Story.

This piece of History, the Author of the Apology (saith the *Vindicator*) *call-eth an imaginary Hypothesis*——— *as if he would*

would beſtor us out of our Principles.

No doubt then, his daring Insolence muſt be chaſtiſed; for Men of Honour and Courage are not to be ſo affronted; and therefore we may reaſonably expect to hear in ſome few Lines after, that the *Vindicator* ſhall name ſome competent Witneſſes, upon whoſe Teſtimony this account may be ſufficiently eſtabliſhed.

Before we come to this cloſe Engage-ment, we muſt endure the *Sallies* and *Excursions* of his Critical ſkill, by which his Antagoniſt muſt be baffled and expoſed. He firſt runs down his Adverſary for ſay-^{*Ibid.*}ing that *Boethius* and others, from whom *Buchanan* borrowed this fabulous Story, were his *contemporary Monks*. But if he had read with as much Attention, as Haſte and Severity, he would have ſeen that the Apologiſt never called *Boethius* a *Monk*; for the *comma* being immediately placed after *Contemporary Monks*, *Boethius* is fairly ſtruck out of the Liſt; and if the *Vindicator* could have answered the Argument that is made uſe of to diſprove the Legendary Fables that he advances, he had never played at ſuch ſmall Game, nor would he have told us, that thoſe Hiſtorians, whom he Cited from *Blondel*, were not contemporary with *Buchanan*, ſince the Author of the Apology told him,

Apol. p. 52.

that *Buchanan* had this Story from his *contemporary Monks*, or such as were little removed from his own Age; which last words he leaves untouched, because they plainly obviated the Objection that he raises against the word (*Contemporary.*)

Def. Vind. p. 56.

However he tells us, that to reason as the Apologist doth, is at one blow to raze the Foundation of the History of our Nation, and that of most others, and to make them all to be Fools who have enquired into these Antiquities that concern our Nation and others. — All of them have spent their time in vain, if this new Judge of Learning may be heard.

To require that a matter of *Fact* be attested by competent Witnesses is, in the Language of our Author, to raze the Foundation of all History. And if History be destroyed, and the Moral certainty that is conveyed by Testimony, then the Authority of Revelation falls, and so Atheism is introduced, at least boundless Scepticism and Uncertainty. Little did the Author of the Apology think, that he advanced so monstrous a proposition, when he asserted, that we cannot believe a matter of *Fact* without sufficient evidence; but the *Vindicator* says, this is to raze the Foundation of all History.

I may be allowed to put him in mind, that unless this Principle is laid down, as our first Foundation; we have no certain Rule to distinguish true or probable History from Legendary Fables and Dreams. Nay, this is supposed as the ground upon which all Judges proceed *in questionibus facti*, that the thing is proved by competent Witnesses, who are presumed to be *bonæ fidei*, who knew the thing that they affirm, or had it transmitted to their Hands by undoubted Records, written by such as might sufficiently know the Truth of what they affirmed.

Now I desire to be informed what is there *new* in this *Hypothesis*. As for his *Irony* against the Apologist, whom he calls a *new Judge of Learning*, I let it pass; for it were Cruelty to destroy an innocent Jest, that no body is pleased with but the Author himself; therefore I go forward to examine, *First*, the Nature of the Argument in general, made use of to disprove this *Monkish* Story of a Presbyterian Church in *Scotland*, near the Apostolic Age; and *Secondly*, I will examine the Principal Testimony upon which this idle Dream is founded.

And I. Let us enquire whether the Argument made use of by the Apologist to disprove this Story, was in it self new,

or such as is not ordinarily used by other Men, upon such occasions, in all Ages, when Fictions are imposed without either Truth or Credibility. The Author of the Apology recommended to the *Vindicator* to Read the Learned *Du Launoy de Autoritate Argumenti negantis in questionibus facti*, And there he might see with his own Eyes, That in all Ages Men reasoned as the Apologist did, by which he might easily perceive, that some may mistake Old things for New things, & vice versa. But if he will not look upon the former Author, he may be advised to view *Eusebius, lib. 3.* where by this very Argument he overthrows the Authority of several Books, that some would impose upon the Church, meerly because they were not duly attested, and because none of the Ancients brought any Testimonies from those Writings; therefore he concluded such Writings were not then received in the Church. And this is no other Argument for the matter, than such as the Apologist made use of. Again, *Eusebius* reasons against the Gospel of *S. Peter*, and his Apocalypse; and by the same Argument he endeavours to shake the Authority of the second Epistle that goes under the name of *S. Clement*. At the same rate *Dionisius* Bishop of *Corinth*, reasons

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 3.

Euseb. hist. ecc. lib. 3. cap. 25. & cap. 38.

Reasons against such Books as he would strike out of the Canon of the Scriptures, and pray where should I make an end, if I named all the Authors who plead against the Authority of any spurious Writings, or any fabulous Legend, from the silence of contemporary Authors.

Nay secondly, I desire to know whether the subject matter will allow of any other method of reasoning. It is acknowledged to be in it self *Questio facti*, and now is it possible to decide any such, but by Testimony, and if there be no sufficient Testimony for the affirmative (which the Presbyterians hold) *viz.* That in the Primitive Ages, the Ecclesiastical Government was managed by Monks without Bishops, in our Country. Then I say in the sense of the Law, such an affirmative must pass for a Fiction, and this I think is no *new* method of reasoning; nor is it possible for all the Philosophers in the World, to name a more proper Argument to decide a *Questio facti*, than that of Testimony.

Thirdly, Whether the opposite Method of believing all things, without examining the Testimonies upon which their credibility is founded, does not open a Door to all Fables and Romances; when that celebrated *Divine* of the *Sorbon*, whom

I formerly named; examined the pretended Miracles and Stories, that were zealously propagated by the Monks, by the Critical Rules of History, the *Religious* Orders made a terrible noise, as if their great *Diana* was immediatly to be pulled down, and then reasoned just as the *Vindicator* doth, that certainly *de Launoy's* method would ruin all History and Religion; the People believed such things as they had zealously propagated amongst them to establish the Reputation of their respective Orders; and therefore it was not time to call in question the Truth of those things that were received amongst their Profelites. Notwithstanding of all this, he persisted in his former Principle, that no matter of *Fact* could be believed unless it was duely attested, and conveyed down to posterity from the Writings of those who were qualified to attest it, and in a capacity to know what they delivered unto others.

It is not possible to imagine, what our Author would be at, when he tells us that this method of reasoning, *razes the Foundation of all History*. On the contrary, it distinguishes true History from Legendary Stories. If a matter of *Fact* be not attested by any credible Author living, within Two hundred Years of the *Period*,
in

n which such a thing is said to have happened, then I say, any Story thus void of all proper Testimony, must pass for a Fable; for the learned *Sorbonist* supposed that the utmost that Oral Tradition could carry any particular matter of *Fact*, could not exceed the space of Two hundred Years; and if no Witnesses appeared for it in that space, then none that came afterwards can be received as credible Witnesses; for where there is no ancient Monument of the thing, nor the Relation confirmed by an uninterrupted Tradition; in such a case, to affirm a matter of *Fact*, stripped naked of all its *Credentials*, is to set up for Lies and Fables, in opposition to the History and Records. If I should affirm that the King of *China* was married Five hundred years ago to a Presbyterian Lady, whom he took Captive in the Wars, that by her good Instructions and Example, he was not only converted to a Christian, but a rigid Presbyterian. My Neighbours no doubt would ask me where I read such a Story; and the plain Truth is, I never read any such thing in my Life: And I am firmly persuaded, that never a Man said it before, and therefore it must needs pass amongst all other the Imaginations, upon this fundamental Reason, that there is no sufficient Testimony to establish the Truth of it.

But

But does our Author think, that the History of our Nation must Perish, if there was not a Presbyterian Church in *Scotland*, so near the Apostolick Age. And does he think to serve the Honour of his Country by saying, that the Evidence for the one, must fall and rise with the evidence for the other. I hope he will consider better of it, and remember that many collateral Proofs may be brought from the Roman Historians, that the Scots inhabited that part of *Britain* long before the imaginary *Period* of his Presbyterian Church; and they were Authors capable to know the Truth of what they wrote for the *Druides*, who were learned and inquisitive both amongst the *Britains* and the *Gauls*, were able to inform the *Roman* what Nations inhabited the several part of this Island.

S. G. M.

Besides, that our learned Advocate hath sufficiently demonstrated, that the manner of reckoning the Scottish Genealogies at their Marriages, their Births, and other remarkable solemnities, was an infallible conveyance of true, constant, and perpetual Traditions. Their *Bards*, whose Science it was to repeat those Genealogies upon solemn occasions, and to celebrate their greatest Achievements in Verse could not add one to the number of their King

King's, but upon the Death of his Predecessor. So that this Tradition was twisted with the Practice and Custom of the Nation, and depends not upon the Fidelity of one Author, but upon the constant and uninterrupted Practice which began in imitation of their Ancestors, from the first Colonies of them, that were planted here; so that the Custom itself was not of any later Date than the Origin of our Nation, in that part of the Island. It is not the Testimony of this or the other Writer, this or the other Generation, but an untraceable Custom, which could not fail, because of the certain manner of its Conveyance. For if they had but added one to the number of their King's that was not formerly heard of, there would be a thousand Witnesses to expose the Forgery. I return from this digression, for I am sensible that it is altogether needless.

And now let me tell the *Vindicator*, when we return to our former subject, that to establish our History upon *shadows* and Stories, is to *raze* it to the Ground, and to destroy it, from which I conclude, that if he does not prove from sufficient Testimony, and by Authors capable to know the Truth of what they wrote,) his Presbyterian Church in *Scotland*, near
the

the Apostolick Times, he must allow my Story of the King of *China*, to be as well attested as the other Monkish Fable, that he so zealously contends for.

Nay, the *Vindicator* himself, (when the Consequences of his own method were not actually under consideration) reasons at the same rate that he blames in his Adversary; for he pleads from the (*pretended*) Silence of the Primitive Writers, for the first Three hundred Years, against the Observation of *Christ-mass*. So natural it is for all Men to reason against the Truth of any matter of *Fact*, from the Silence of such as ought to Record it. And tho' he mistook the *Theme*, to which he applyed this *Medium*, yet the Argument in it self, (if no Testimony could be brought to the contrary) was Reasonable and Agreeable to the common and approved Methods in such Cases.

Now when so much is said in Defence of the Argument in its Nature and Original force, he may again consult *Blonde* and all those Authors, from whom he had this Story of his Presbyterian *Culdees* and see if any of them was a competent Witness in an Affair, at so great a distance from the time in which they lived. Let them inform us from whom they had this
Story

Story; for a Witness at the distance of Eight or nine Hundred Years, is as incompetent, as he that Writes at the distance of Sixteen thousand. The Monks before the Reformation knew nothing of true Ecclesiastical Antiquity; and those Gentlemen who built upon their Stories were highly guilty of Inadvertence.

I again desire to know an Instance of any Presbyterian Church, in any place of the World, before the Days of *Calvin* and *Beza*. As for the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, who got up in the Twelfth Century, they only declaimed against the corrupt manners of the Church of *Rome*; and if they had no Bishops, it was because their Circumstances were unsettled, they were driven from one place to another, that their Ecclesiastical Polity, could not be reared into any fixt Establishment: Nor did they ever declaim against the subordination of one Priest unto another; and tho' they had been in all regards Presbyterian, they are too late a *Precedent* for any Christian Church to argue from their Practice.

Our Author answers, that if his Adversary had read Blondel from the beginning to the end, he should find Instances in Def. Vint. p. 37. all the Christian Churches, in Asia, Europe,

rope, and Africa, and that he should have answered all that he had Written in his Apology.

To which I reply, that he never wrote any thing in defence of Presbytery, but what hath been frequently and solidly refuted. Let the *Vindicator* read *Blondel*, *Salmastius* and *Dalle*, and see, if out of them all, he can name one Presbyterian Church managing Ecclesiastical Affairs in perfect Parity and Equality. It is very easy for him to set us Tasks, as if we were obliged to give him an account of our Proficiency and Reading; and therefore I desire him (having no less Authority over him, than he hath over me) to Read *Blondel* from the beginning to the end, and let him chuse out of his Voluminous Collections, those Instances, that he thinks cannot be answered; and let him strengthen *Blondell's* Argument with as many improvments of his own, as he judges convenient; and if they are unanswerable, then he may Triumph with the greater success over his baffled Adversaries. Nay, I make him a more reasonable Offer; let him single out Ten or Twelve instances out of all the Churches of *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*, where he thinks the strength of his Cause lies, and this may be done in little room, without
these

these tedious Altercations and Mistakes, and they shall be fairly considered. It was reasonable for the Apologist to think, that the first Christians among the *Scots* knew no other Church Government, than that which they were acquainted with, by whom they were converted, and I am very confident those were no Presbyterians; for amongst all the ancient Hereticks I find none less considered than *Aerius*, or whose Party was more contemptible or of shorter continuance.

I begin now to be afraid, that the *Vindicator* thinks, that I have forgotten my promise, I made to examine his *Testimony*, by which he would oblige us to believe that there was a Presbyterian Church in *Scotland* near the Apostolick Age, in the end of the Second, or beginning of the Third Century. I ask in the first place who said so? He tells us, *Blondel*. I demand again, from whom had *Blondel* this Story? *Blondel* says he had it from *John Fordon* and *John Major*, and the Third he cites is *Boethius*. But it is very ominous in the beginning, to find that *Boethius* plainly contradicts the first two Witnesses named by *Blondel*. *Fordon* says, That the *Scots*, before the coming of *Palladius*, were taught in the Faith, and had the Sacraments administered to

Blondel. Apol. p. 314. 315.

them only by Priests and Monks: *John Major* says the same; but *Boethius* tells us, that about the Year 263, our Country men began, *Christi dogma accuratissime amplexari*, that they were Taught by the *Culdæi*, and that all Priests afterwards were called by that name; and a little after——*Pontificem inter se communi suffragii deligebant, penes quem divinarum rerum esset potestas.* And then that *Palladius* was the first Bishop that was ordain'd by the Pope; *cum antea populi suffragiis ex Monachis & Culdæis Pontifices assumerentur.* So that *Boethius* was perswaded that we had Bishops in *Scotland* before *Palladius*; he only tells us, that *Palladius* was the first Bishop that came from *Rome*; nor does he say, that the *Culdæi* laid their Hands upon the Bishop, as *Blondel*, (after his way,) adds to his Words. For there is nothing said by *Boethius*, but That the Bishops were Elected from amongst the Priests and the Monks.

Now here are Three Witnesses, and the last contradicts the other two: And I except against all the Three, that none of them could be a competent Witness in Affairs of that Nature, at so great a distance from their own time, unless they had named the Authors and Records, upon whose Testimony their Relation was founded.

founded. And the *Vindicator* himself is as good an Evidence for this imaginary Parity, in the Primitive Ages, as either *Fordon*, *Major*, or *Boethius*, thô all of them had agreed in the same Testimony.

But let us examine this Affair to the bottom, and not interrupt our Author; he (the Apologist) doth also deal unfairly, and not as a disputant with the *Vindicator*; for he taketh no notice of what grounds he brought for what he affirmed, viz. That *Palladius* was the first Bishop in Scotland, and yet Christianity was publickly Professed in it above 300 Years before his time; this is proved out of *Baronius*, *Spondanus*, *Beda*, and others, but it was his Wisdom to take no notice of this. And to make all sure he says, that *Spondanus* out of *Prosper* writes, that *Palladius* was the first Bishop who came among the Scots; and *Baronius* sheweth, that they were Converted some Centuries before his time, i. e. as the *Vindicator* formerly explain'd himself, above 300 Years before *Palladius*.

Now I am resolv'd to be a little more rash and daring than the Apologist was; he durst not it seems examine the grounds upon which the *Vindicator* proceeded, at least it was his Wisdom to take no notice of those Arguments, that were too hot for his Fingers. Now thô so many Authors

are named, the whole Stress lies upon the Authority of *Prosper*. *Spondanus* epitomiz'd *Baronius*, and *Baronius* built upon the Authority of *Prosper*: so the Controversie is at length come to this, Whether *Prosper* affirms that above 300 Years before *Palladius* was sent by *Pope Celestin*, there was a Presbyterian Church in *Scotland*. And if we find that *Prosper* says no such thing, then all this noise of Authors and Testimonies vanish into Silence and a profound Mistake..

In the first place, I cannot excuse the *Vindicator* from supine negligence at least, that he does not read the Authors that he cites, else he had not named *Baronius*, who never thought that *Palladius* was sent by *Pope Celestin* to the *Scoto-Britanni*, but rather to the *Irish*; for speaking of his Mission, he hath these words; *perductum quoque fuisse ad Hiberniam insulam, sed cito morte subductum ex hac vita migrasse, ex Probo qui res gestas S. Patricii scripsit dictum est superius, Hibernorum quidem conversionem Deus. S. Patricio reservavit.*

Now whatever the Testimony of *Prosper* be, *Spondanus* and *Baronius* leaves the *Vindicator*; for they understood *Prosper's* words of *Palladius* his Mission to *Ireland*, and not to that part of *Britain* which is now called *Scotland*. Last

Last of all, let us hear the Testimony ^{Ciron. Tyron.} it self, upon which *Baronius* built his ^{Prosop.} Narrative, and that is cited from the *Chronicle* of *Prosper*, and he flourished about the Year 444.

The words cited from *Prosper* are these, *Basso & Antiocho Coss. Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Celestino Palladius, & primus Episcopus mittitur.*

The Augustan Copy of the same *Chronicle* reads it thus, *Basso & Antiocho Coss. Ad Scotos in Christum credentes, ordinatus a Papa Celestino Palladius, primus Episcopus missus est.*

Supposing then that this *Chronicon per Consules digestum*, whence this Testimony is cited, was written by *Prosper*, all that can be inferr'd is, that *Palladius* was the first Bishop of the *Roman Mission*, which is easily granted; for as soon as the Pope aspired to his unlimited and universal Supremacy, there were several Bishops sent to other Churches, already constituted, not to introduce Episcopacy, which was the Government of the Universal Church, but rather a Subjection to, and Uniformity with the *Roman See*. This was the business of *Austin* the Monk in *England*; and *Hector Boethius* understood the History of *Palladius* in this sense, whom he represents as the first Bishop

sent from *Rome*, and the words themselves insinuate no other meaning; neither is it evident from the *Chronicon per consules digestum*, whether there was any formed Organiz'd Church amongst the *Scoti in Christum credentes*, when *Palladius* was sent by *Celestin*.

To let this go, there is something more to be observed, it is this, that the *Chronicon per Consules digestum* is not thought by the Learned to be the genuine Work of *Prosper*, because it is so very unlike his Stile, and written by a more obscure Author, later perhaps than the Days of *Prosper*. It is very true, that *Prosper* wrote a *Chronicon ab orbe condito*, but that other, *per Consules digestum*, whence *Baronius* had the words just now mentioned, is none of his. The true *Chronicon* written by *Prosper* is lost, only a Fragment of it is preserved, in which there is not one word of *Palladius*, being sent to the *Scots*. And *P. Pithæus* in his Preface to that fragment of *Prosper's* Chronicle, hath these words; & *vero quamvis in annorum notatione valde confusum perturbatumque sit, Prosperi tamen ingenium sic refert, ut non immerito videatur membrum esse amplioris ejus, quod ipsius nomine ab orbe condito ad captam a Vandalis Romam, Gennadius Massiliensis Presbyter se legisse testatur, ac mire-*

mur unde factum sit ut aliud per Consules digestum hæcenus in omnibus Hieronymiani Chronici Editionibus Prosperi Titulo subjungeretur quod etsi cum isto non pauca habeat communia, utpote ad ejusdem ætatis Historiam pertinencia, alterius tamen genii esse facile intelliget, qui utrumque attentius legerit. And the Learned Doctor Cave informs us, how sadly the *Chronicon Consulare* hath been spoiled and interpolated by the Boldness and Ignorance of Transcribers.

Biblioth. Max.
patrum lugd.
1677 Tom 8.

Let the *Vindicator* consider, that when we dissect this Testimony from *Prosper*, and see all its Defects and Weaknesses, it serves him to no purpose. *Baronius* and *Spondanus* never understood it in his Sense; and the Author of the Chronicle (whoever he was) affirmed only, that *Palladius* was the first Bishop of the Roman Mission; and this is all that is found in the *Chronicon per Consules digestum*, which is lamentably spoil'd by several interpolations. And for the Presbyterian *Culdees*, not one of them is mention'd; and as for the Fragment that is preserved of the true *Chronicon*, written by *Prosper*, there is not a word of this Affair to be met with in it.

Hist lit. p. 350.

Now let me stand upon my former ground, and ask where the Historians are

that affirm there was a Presbyterian Church in *Scotland*, in the first Ages of Christianity. The *Vindicator* says above 300 Years before *Palladius* was sent, and he being sent in the Year 431, (as *Baronius* says) by the *Vindicators* Calculations, we had a Presbyterian Church in *Scotland* towards the beginning of the Second Century, when we have no certain Records of any Progress that Christianity made in this Island at that time. But some Men are very happy who entertain their pleasant Dreams and Visions for true Histories. We read of a *Gentleman* at *Athens*, who thought that all the Ships that came in to the *Piræum* were his own, and he could prove it by as good Testimony, as any our Author brings for his Presbyterian Church in the Primitive Ages.

I am still of the Opinion that the Monks advanced this Fable, to gratifie the *Popes* design of exempting the Religious Orders from Episcopal Jurisdiction; that they were encouraged to do so by the *Pope*, needs neither *Proof* nor *Illustration*: And this was all that was intended by the Author of the Apology, that the Monks were made subservient by the Court of *Rome*, to trample upon the Episcopal Dignity. This last proposition may be confidently affirmed,

affirmed, tho' the Origin of the Fable be left as a Conjecture. But the *Vindicator* is at great pains to squeeze his Adversary's words, that he may find in them some flaw or other, as to their Position and Order. I wish he would think such Observations below his gravity; for I never read a Book that lies more open to Remarks of that Nature, than that which I now consider: And one, that cannot preserve his Title Page free from Inadvertence and Mistake, ought to be somewhat merciful in his Trifling and lesser Criticisms. There was never any such Book written as the *Apology of the Clergy*, else it had been much more accurate and exact, than that which was attempted hastily by one of their number, in their Defence, to stop the Calumnies that were then loudly propagated, to defame them. In another place, our Author represents his Adversary, as if he thought there were no Foreign Protestants but the *French*; I heartily forgive him, if he was altogether so ignorant, it was great Condescension in him, to take any notice of him.

C H A P. V.

The Presbyterian Doctrine concerning Rites and Ceremonies examined.

I Make haste to consider another Article of the Presbyterian Doctrine, which is altogether New, and their own; for they teach, That a significant Rite in the Worship of God, not founded upon Divine Institution, is superstitious, unlawful, and abominable; and such as may Legitimate a separation from any Church, where it is enjoyned to preserve Order and Uniformity. And upon this vain and silly *Theorem* they have raised Tragical Complaints, broken the Unity of the Church, and filled the Heads and Mouths of the People, with a Thousand Airy and unaccountable Fancies.

It is not my design in so short a Discourse, to gather together all the Raveries that have been vented in this Controversie. I must not enter into that Labyrinth and idle Talk; I am only concern'd in a few words, to vindicate the Practice

Practice of all Christian Churches, from the later Foolleries that have been objected against it.

In the first place, Can they name any Society of Men that ever met together in publick, to Worship God, without some such significant Ceremony, which had no other Original, than humane Appointment? I wish no other Ceremonies to be introduced into the Church, than those that are already received, either by the Custom of the Nation, or impos'd by the Wisdom of our Superiours: And to question the Lawfulness of such, is idly to declaim against the Practice of all Nations.

The Light of Nature teaches us to worship God, and all Men have agreed in this, that the solemn Worship of the Deity ought to be performed in Unity and Society. *Secondly*, That this publick Worship should be fixed and established by the Wisdom and Authority of competent Judges, as to the manner and method. *Thirdly*, That we ought to express our Adoration in the publick Worship of God, by such significant Signs of Piety and Devotion, as are known in that Nation where we live to express our Reverence and Esteem. *Fourthly*, Those significant Signs being indifferent in their Nature,

Nature, are variable according to the Age, or Country, with whom we have to do, and may be changed by the Authority and Wisdom of our *Superiours*, as oft as there is sufficient Reason, of which they only are the Judges.

These things (I think) are plain to all who view the Precepts of Natural Religion, or the consequential Practices of all civiliz'd Nations. It is not possible to form an Objection against the decent visible motions of the Body in publick Worship, which may not be improved against all the Vocal expressions of the Tongue. The last our Adversaries allow of, and by consequence they ought to admit the other. Nature led us at first to the *Worship* of the Deity; this *Worship* was performed uniformly; therefore the exterior part of it was so managed, as to signify to all our *Associates* in that *Worship* the profound Reverence wherewith we approached the most High God; and this again must needs bring along with it those outward significations of Respect, that are made decent by Custom and Authority, to whose Decision alone God left those exterior *Rituals* of *Worship*.

As for the two Sacraments of the New Testament, they fall under another Consideration; they are Seals and Convey-

ances

ances of the Evangelical blessings and favours, as well as plain and open Significations of our Worship and Obedience, and therefore, in their complex Nature and Tendency, they must be founded upon positive and Divine Institution. It is true, there were many Ceremonies in the Law founded upon express Authority, but they were all of them either discriminative Badges of the *Jews* from the Idolatrous Nations, or Typical; therefore it was convenient, that the Divine Authority should immediatly interpose in the appointment of such Ceremonies. As for those Rites in the Worship of God, that were only Significations of Reverence and Uniformity, they were still retain'd amongst the *Jews*, as they were transmitted to them by *Patriarchal* Custom and Tradition, tho' only founded upon Human appointment.

My Author tells me, that he had *much* Def. Vind. p. 39. occasion to consider this Controversie about Ceremonies; that he read *many of our side*, but never met with any who managed it so slightly as his present Adversary.

All this may be true, for his Design was not to write long Treaties's on that subject; and what he wrote then, was hastily put together. In the mean time, he made use of some Arguments that were
formerly

formerly insisted on by others of unquestionable Sufficiency, and which he thinks are not yet answered, tho' he hath been insulted very superciliously upon this Head. The general *Medium* that he made use of is this, there are several significant Ceremonies mentioned in, and alluded to, in the Holy Scriptures, which were Practis'd in the Worship of God, under the *Patriarchal*, *Jewish*, and *Christian Oeconomy*, which had no other Original, than Humane appointment; and therefore he concluded, that such Usages were in their own Nature lawful, and not at all tainted with Superstition. And tho' this, or the other particular Ceremony was in it self indifferent, yet the Obedience that is due to our *Superiours*, in things lawful, is necessary to the ends of publick Worship and Uniformity.

Let us then consider the few Instances that were named by the Apologist, to prove such *significant* Ceremonies Lawful, and the first is, *Exod. 3. 5. Moses* is commanded to *put of his Shoes*, before he approached the place of God's extraordinary Presence; and why? because

Def. Vind. p. 38.

the place whereon he stood was Holy-ground
 Here (saith the *Vindicator*) is accurate Logick, and may become the highest Seat in an University. We ought to obey what God commandeth;

commandeth; ergo, we must observe what Man deviseth and enjoyneth in God's Worship. And a little after, *If this be a Ceremony which all must observe, why doth not our Author and his Party observe it?*

If his Adversary had affirmed that whatever Ceremony expresses our Reverence in one Country, or one Age, must necessarily do so in all Ages and Nations, then he might ask this jocular, (but very impertinent) Question. As for the Jest of accurate Logick, and the highest Seat in an University, I have nothing to say to it but this, that it reflects as much on the profoundly Learned Mr. Mede, as on the other whom he frequently upbraids for want of Logick.

And I am of the Opinion that he deserved the highest Seat in any University, where true Knowledge and Innocence were thought valuable things. And if his Adversary built his Argument upon Mr. Mede's Hypothesis, he might have spared him until he got him alone unguarded by the Authority of so great a Name. But I suppose that he had him only in his view, when this mighty *Witicism* broke forth. If the Author of the Apology possessed the highest Seat in an University, he never thought that he deserved it above many of his Brethren; and

and I hope the *Vindicator* himself is so good a Protestant, as not to pretend *merit* for his present Elevation.

However, the Argument stands yet in full force, if he does not prove that in the Text cited there is contained an Original positive Institution of that Ceremony of Discalceation, practis'd in the Worship of God amongst the *Eastern Nations*, under the *Patriarchal Oeconomy*. But when we read the Text with Attention, there is no appearance of any such Institution: *Moses* is admonished not to approach the Bush, until first he *put off his Shoes*; and the reason is added, *the place whereon he stood was Holy-ground*. And so this Admonition supposes him acquainted with the current Practice and Custom, before he was put in mind of God's extraordinary Presence in that place. Besides that the words in the Text have nothing in them of the Nature of an Institution, but rather a Divine Advertisement, which the meanest in the Country would have understood as well as *Moses*; and it is rather a strong Confirmation that the Ceremonies which express our Reverence in the publick Worship are acceptable to God, as significations of our Humility and Adoration, tho' they are Originally founded upon Human

man Authority, as this of *Discalceation* was; and if *Moses* in his Approaches to the bush, had put off his Shoes before the Advertisement came to his Ears, he had done nothing that was in it self superstitious or undecent; for the reason that is annexed to the Advertisement, supposes him acquainted with the Custom, before he was thus informed by an extraordinary Apparition. So then here we have not the Commandment of God in opposition to Human Ordinance, but rather his Approbation of a Ceremony in Divine Worship, which had no other Original Institution than the Custom of those *Eastern Nations*. *Vide Mede.*

Another instance mentioned by the Author of the Apology, was that of *Sackcloth* and *Ashes*, as signifying Grief and Sorrow in their solemn Humiliations.

To this he answers. *Why then do not the Prelatists use them?* But there is hardly any thing can match this for *Nonsense*; or if these Signs of Humiliation were still in use in our Country, who would refuse them, that was not resolved to be singular?

Another instance mentioned to prove significant Ceremonies of Human Institution lawful in the Worship of God, was *ad hominem*, viz. That of *lifting up the*
S Right

Right Hand bare in swearing the Covenant.

To this he Answers, that the Ceremony of lifting up the right Hand in swearing an Oath, not only hath Warrant from Scripture Example, but it is the civil Custom of the Nation; therefore it is not pertinent to bring it as an example of a Religious significant Ceremony.

But I ask whether a Ceremony's being mentioned in the Scripture, makes it *only* allowable; or was it not in it self lawful and decent, before it was Recorded in any Scripture Example, and is it not Lawful to us, upon the same Original Reasons that made it Lawful to them, who first Practic'd it? and it was decently and lawfully Practic'd before it was mentioned in any Scripture Example; and the allusions that are made to such usages in Scripture, prove them lawful beyond all Contradiction, antecedently to any mention of them in the Holy Scriptures. And 'tis wonderful to think that our Presbyterians should grant, that there are many such Customs and Ceremonies alluded to in Holy Writings, (when they are only Incidentally and occasionally Recorded) which had no other Original than Humane Appointment, and yet deny the lawfulness of such Rites and Ceremonies, unless they

they are founded upon exprefs Divine Institution, *i.e.* The Scriptures are Witnesses, that under the *Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Oeconomy* Men have been always sottishly superstitious, and yet this superstition was neither discovered nor blamed by any of the Prophets or the Apostles, until the Presbyterians appeared.

We are next to hear a most Metaphysical distinction, *viz.* *That if a Ceremony be the civil Custom of the Nation, then it may be applyed to Religion. Then they are not Religious Ceremonies, i.e. peculiar to Religion, but are civil Rites, thô used in Religion.* Def. Vind. p. 39.

This is a piece of New Philosophy, and seems to be coe-val with Presbytery, even in its latest Figure. If it be a *civil Ceremony*, thô it should be admitted into the Worship of God, without any Divine Institution, there is no danger in it, but a *significant Ceremony* introduced into the publick Worship by Human appointment, is abominable and superstitious. If the civil Authority can introduce a significant Ceremony into the Worship of God, why may not the Ecclesiastical Authority do it? The pretended danger to Religion from significant Ceremonies, was their having no higher Authority than what

was Humane. But the *Vindicator* tells us, That there is no hazard to apply a *civil Ceremony* to the immediate Worship of God, were it never so significant and Symbolical; but if it be a Ceremony of Human appointment, and not us'd in civil and solemn Actions, then immediately it is Superstition and *will-Worship*.

I always thought that a Sign or Ceremony that owed its Original to civil Authority, Custom, or Appointment, was in it self a Human Ordinance. A Ceremony established by civil Authority in the Worship of God (were it never so significant and Symbolical) may be complied with, without the least fear of Popery; but if it be of any Ecclesiastical appointment, *and only applied to Religion*, from that very moment it becomes a *Limb of Antichrist*, some Rag of the Whore of *Babylon*.

But may not I be allowed to ask how the one can be so innocent, and the other so abominable? Is not that which is appointed by civil Authority, Symbolical and significant? Yes; for the lifting up of our Hands signifies our immediate Appeal to the Omniscience of Heaven, and to the Justice of God, if we wilfully desert what then we promise. Is not this Symbolical Ceremony practic'd in the
Worship

Worship of God? Yes; for when we take our deliberate Oath, we Worship God in the most solemn manner. Is it not of Human appointment? Yes; for it hath no Divine Institution, and yet notwithstanding of all these, it is by the *Vindicator's* concession, free of all Superstition and Idolatry.

It remains still a Mystery, why a Ceremony appointed by Ecclesiastical Authority, and for no other end, than to preserve Decency and Uniformity, in the publick Worship of God, should not be as little tainted with superstition as the former. And besides it's very hard to distinguish a significant Ceremony, that derives its Original from civil Authority, from a *Symbolical* Rite, that owes its beginning to some Ecclesiastical Constitution, especially if the one and the other have obtain'd place in the Christian Church, by immemorial possession; as for Example, how do we know that the Ceremony of kissing the *Evangel* when we take an Oath, had its first rise from the civil Authority, or from the Ecclesiastical Laws: and how sadly must we be perplext, when we know that a significant Ceremony, hath both the civil and Ecclesiastical Sanction to Authorize it. It is Stubbornness and Disobedience to re-

first it in the first Sense ; it is Superstition and Idolatry to comply with it in the second.

If we consider the Ecclesiastical Ceremonies as having the *civil Sanction*, they are in that regard civil Ceremonies. May we not then view them all under that *Reduplication*, and so comply with them, abstracting from their being appointed by Ecclesiastical Authority.

And how comes it to pass, that the civil Magistrate, or the Traditional Custom of a Nation, can Legitimate a significant Ceremony in the Worship of God, and yet the Canons and Constitutions of the Church cannot do it? And how come the Presbyterians (who formerly pretended to oppose Erastianism) to give the civil Magistrate such an unlimited Power about the Decencies of publick Worship, but the Ecclesiastical Authority must not presume to meddle with it? By the first a significant Ceremony, in the Worship of God, may be made Grave, Venerable, and Decent ; but if it has its rise from the second, it becomes immediately Idolatry, Superstition, and what else you please.

According to the *Vindicator*, a Ceremony that is us'd in civil Actions, may be applied to Religious Solemnities, and then

then I think it was a very easy thing to reconcile all the Presbyterians to the Church; for if the few Ceremonies that they quarell'd had been at anytime us'd in civil Solemnities, all their scruples vanished, and the Ceremonies of the Church would in that case be as innocent as the *Cloaks, Cravats,* and *long Periwigs*, that are now used in their publick Appearances.

But here ariseth a new Scruple. Suppose that the Significant Ceremony of *Lifting up the right hand bare* hath another Signification in Civil Actions, than that which it hath in Religious Worship, *Queritur*, Whether its being us'd in a different Signification, in Civil Actions, may make it Lawful in Religious Worship, when it hath a higher Signification? This I think is very difficult to be understood; and therefore I desire the *Vindicator* to tell me why a Significant Ceremony of Humane Appointment us'd in Civil Actions, in one Signification, can be made Lawful in Religious Worship, when the Signification is very different from the former? As for Example, when they Swore their Conspiracy of the *League and Covenant*, they were to *hold up their right hand bare*. The Signification of it in this Solemn Act of Worship, was

their Appeal to the Omniscience of God, concerning their Resolution and Sincerity : But if at any time this Ceremony of *lifting up the hand bare* is applied to Civil Actions or Solemnities *as such*, I hope the Signification of it must be very different from what it was in the immediate Worship of God. But according to this New Philosophy, a Ceremony is made Lawful, in the Worship of God, if it is us'd in Civil Actions, tho' it change its Signification in the First, from what it was designed to represent in the Second. If the Wit of Man can name me any thing that is more Absurd and Ridiculous, more Unaccountable and Foolish, I am deceived. I do not know whether such *Theorems* be fit for the *Highest Seat in an University*, or not. I am very confident they are past all Natural Understanding.

I have no Inclination to rob a Man of the pleasant Ideas that he may have of himself, or his own Performances. I would be as easie to *such* as is possible, and therefore I shall endeavour to name a Ceremony practis'd in the Solemn and Immediate Worship of God, founded upon no Divine or express Institution; and yet in it self very Lawful, and never us'd (for any thing I know) in Civil Solemn-

Solemnities. And if this be made evident, then I suppose all the little Exceptions against Significant Ceremonies in the Worship of God, are Idle and Frivolous Impertinencies. But I think I can do this, when I invite your Thoughts and Attention to *Rom. 6. 4.* *Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism unto Death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*

I know no body denies, but that in this Text there is a palpable Allusion unto that Significant Ceremony of *Immersion*, practised by the first Christians in their Administration of Baptism. To prove that this Ceremony was Practised by the *Jews* and first Christians, were to despise my Adversary more than Modesty will allow. The first Christians changed not that Rite in Baptism, from what it was Practised amongst the *Jews*. It is true, that the Signification of it among the Christians, did more clearly relate to the Death and Resurrection of the *Messias*, than was expressly known among the *Jews*; but this Ceremony was founded on the Practice of the Jewish Church, and from them derived to the Christians, and never established by any other Authority, than what was purely Humane
and

and Ecclesiastical. When they were Baptized, both amongst the Jews and the Christians, they were once all over under Water: This Immersion among the Jews, signified that their *Profelytes* must die to their former *Gods, Idolatries, Superstitions, and Pagan Abominations*. This was a Custom so known amongst them, that all their Learned Neighbours were acquainted with it; but amongst the Christians it signified not only the Change of their former Religion, but particularly their Conformity to Christ in his Death and Resurrection: which Signification of a Humane Ceremony the Apostle puts them in mind of, that by that very Custom, which had no other Original than Ecclesiastical Appointment, they were obliged to be mortified to the World, and to be raised unto Newness of Life. *Grotius* * expressees it fully and plainly; *Ostendit non verba tantum baptismi sed & ipsam ejus formam hoc innuere, nam immersio totius corporis in flumen, ita ut non conspiceretur amplius, imaginem gerebat sepulture que datur mortuis. Sic ad Colossenses cap. 2. ver. 12. Ἔτι δὲ βαπτισμὸν, ad representandam etiam oculis Christi mortem.*

Now here is a Significant Ceremony, founded upon no Divine Institution, and in

*Cornel. Tacit. Hist. Lib. 5. Circumcidere genitalia instituerunt, ut diversitate noscantur transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quidquam prius imbutur, quam contemnere deos exire Patriam: Parentes, Liberos, Fratres, vilia habere. * In Locum.*

in the immediate Worship of God, practised by the Apostolical Churches. Saint *Paul* tells you what the Signification of the Ceremony was, *viz.* by the Immersion, the Death and Crucifixion of the old Man (by our being raised again out of the Waters, the Resurrection of our blessed *Saviour*, and in consequence of that our Newness of Life.

If this Ceremony was founded upon any express Institution, I desire to know the particular Text or Place of Scripture. And if it was not, then the *New Principles* that condemn all such significant Rites are Dreams and *Chimera's*, inconsistent with the Dictates of Humane Reason, and the Practice of all Nations. For the Apostle reasons from the Visible Ceremony of the Christian Church in his own days, to put the *Romans* in mind of their Promises and Engagements. The Administration of Baptism, as it was then Celebrated, represented in a Visible and Sensible manner the Burial of our *Saviour*, and his Resurrection: which Symbolical actions signified our *Dying unto Sin*, and our being *Raised unto Newness of Life*.

If it be said, that this Significant Ceremony of Immersion was used in Civil Actions, and so might be applied to Religion;

ligion ; then I desire to know when, how, and where it was applied to any other than a Religious Action. If it be said that we have Scripture example for it, then I would ask whether it was allowable, in the practice of the first Christians and Jews, before it was Recorded, or alluded to, in any place of the *New Testament*. Its being mentioned thus is but a *consequent* of its being Practised, and not at all the Cause of its being Lawful. And if it was Lawful, then I say a Significant Ceremony, in the solemn Worship of God, founded upon no Divine Institution, *applied only to Religion*, is in it self Lawful, and frequently useful, when regulated and determined by Wise and Prudent Governors.

From this, not only the former Inference may be deduced, but also another, *viz.* That the Power of Rituals is still lodged in the Church, which she may Vary and Alter, to serve the ends of Edification until the end of the World. And the current practice of the Presbyterians, is as unagreeable to this Rite of *Immersion*, in the Administration of Baptism, as that of any other Christian Church.

I know not whether the *Vindicator* shall be pleased with this Instance, for it is no more than the Continuation and Improve-

Improvement of the first *Medium*, viz. That there are frequent Allusions in the Scripture to such Significant Rites and Usages practised in the Worship of God, which were established only by Ecclesiastical Authority and Appointment. Upon this Foundation the Author of the Apology thought that such Rites and Usages were Lawful; and therefore thô he might be in an Error, the *Vindicator* should not treat him with so much Disdain and Severity: for it is not possible in every Line to hit the Subject so *Exactly* and so *Happily*, as to stop the Mouth of every obstinate Adversary. And when we reason against Men of Age and Experience, it is needless to appear armed at all times with the School-*Fargon* and *Formality* of *Syllogism*. But if nothing please but what is rear'd unto Logical Form and Figure, it might be thus proposed.

A Significant Ceremony founded upon no Divine Institution, and alluded to, in *S. Paul's* Reasonings, *Rom. 6. 4.* is a thing in it self Lawful.

But the Ceremony of Immersion, in the Administration of Baptism, was founded upon no Divine Institution, and yet alluded to by *S. Paul*, as a thing received in the current Practice of the Apostolical Church; *Ergo,*

Ergo, such a Significant Ceremony in the Worship of God, founded upon no Divine Institution is in it self Lawful.

Vid. John 3. 23.
Matth. 3. 6. ib.
Acts 8. 38.

The first Proposition I hope is out of all danger: for that which the Apostle alludes to, in the Practice of the Apostolical Church, is at least Safe and Innocent; for he advances nothing but from Undoubted Reason or Revelation. The Second is as much beyond question as the first, if there be any such allusion as is mentioned in the words of *S. Paul*, which I think is beyond all Controversie, when we consider the Manner of Baptizing among the Jews by Immersion, and the Practice of the Primitive Christians, which might be illustrated from the most Ancient Records, particularly from the Writings of *Tertullian*: and it was this Rite of Immersion that made the attendance of the *Deaconesses* so necessary in the Apostolic Church, when Women were Baptiz'd, because the whole body was once all under Water. And the *Rubric* of the Church of *England* mentions *Dipping* in the first place, as being the Original Ceremony, but leaves it to the *Administrator*, whether *Dipping*, or *Pouring Water on the Face* be thought most convenient. The *Anabaptists* insist upon it as absolutely Necessary. The

Antient

Ancient Churches *Uniformly* practis'd it, and the whole Society of Christians, Ancient and Modern, agreed in the Lawfulness of it: and if it was unbecoming the *Highest Seat in an University* to reason from such Allusions, it may be very proper for another to expose the *Sophistry* of it, since he tells us so often of his *accurate Logic* and strict Laws of Consequence, against which I believe he thinks very few are able to stand.

The Protestants abroad, who have most receded from the Practices of the Roman Church, never thought that a Significant Ceremony, in the Worship of God, was in it self Superstitious and Unlawful: Nor did they think *them* parts of Worship, as is *Contentiously* suggested by Inconsiderate People. If I was to fill this Treatise with Citations, I would weary the Reader. It may suffice to name only the Protestants in the Valley of *Piedmont*, who were so far from condemning such Rites, that until the Year 1630. they kept their ancient Custom of the *Trine* Asperision in Baptism, and the *Trine* Fraction in the other Sacrament, and of Unleavened Bread: but these were afterwards changed, when all their old Ministers died in the time of the War: they were then forced to employ some

*Vid. Durel. adversus irre-
recund. crimi-
nal. Schismat.*

*V. Le Histoire
generale des
Eglises Evange-
liques de Vallees
de Piedmont,
par Jean Leger.
p. 206.*

Geneva

Geneva Students, who, by degrees practised according to the Custom of their own Church.

I have dwelt too long upon the former Theme. The next that falls under Consideration are his Thoughts of *Ordination*, where he justifies what was formerly said to the Reproach of our Bishops, that *some of them*, upon the Restoration of the Government, submitted to *Re-Ordination*, to the great Scandal, *not only of this*, (*viz.* the Presbyterian Kirk of *Scotland*) *but other Reformed Churches.*

Def. Vind. p. 39.

All this signifies no more, than that the Presbyterians are resolved to be Scandalized at every thing the Bishops do. But our *Vindicator* is very Critical, for he observes, that his Adversary makes all the *Foreign Churches*, and the *French Divines* to be convertible terms. The Poor Creatures that he disputes against, never heard of any Reformed Churches abroad. My advice is, that he would forbear such Observations, for I could pick more than a hundred *Solecisms* out of his Book that I have now in my hands. For since he cannot order his Title Page without mistaking the Position of his Particles, he ought not to Impute those Faults and *Blunders* to his Adversary, that are only lodg'd in his own Imagination. The

The other Censure is levelled against his Adversary's *University Learning*, with the *want* of which he is frequently Upbraided. Now the *Vindicator* informs us, Def. Vind. p. 40. that he understood not that *Trite* distinction of *Materialiter* and *Formaliter*.

What an unhappy drudgery it is to be condemn'd to answer such raveries. Did the Author of the Apology ever say that there was no such distinction, and that it might not be used pertinently upon many Occasions. But the *Vindicator* is at some pains to prove that such a Distinction as *Materialiter* and *Formaliter* may be used. He is a very Charitable Man that condescends to teach the deprived Clergy the Necessity of that distinction *Materialiter & Formaliter*, which he Learnedly illustrates by the Example of an *Usurper*. I would only ask him, whether it be worth his Apol. p. 57. while to write Books for the Information of such *Blockheads*, as he represents his Adversaries to be.

The Author of the Apology intended no more than to expose the *Application* of that Distinction, to the Oath of *Canonical Obedience*; for since Mr. M. granted that one may pay *Material Canonical Obedience*, he must needs yield, in the same breath, that what his *Ordinary* commanded, was in it self Lawful; and so if all

of them had conformed, they would have done nothing but what he acknowledges to be Just and Reasonable in it self, and consequently there was no occasion for their clamouring so much against *Canonical Obedience*.

A Man, who for several Years obeyed what was enjoyned by his *Diocesan*, and Signed a Paper, which his Bishop judged Equivaient to a promise of full and *Canonical Obedience*, who moved in all publick Steps of his Function, without any visible Distinction from his Brethren, meeting with them at the Hours and Days appointed for the Ordinary Exercise of Discipline and other Solemn Administrations. If there was nothing intended by him, but only *Material Canonical Obedience*, one would have thought it a very odd chance, that he was so Regular and Uniform in his Practices, as to do what his Neighbours did in the same manner, and in the same Seasons; if this was not *Formal Canonical Obedience*, at least *præ se ferebat imaginem formalis obedientiæ*. And I had rather incur the danger of *Formal Canonical Obedience*, than the suspicion of Hypocrisie.

Suppose that a *Cameronian Soldier* in the *Confederate Army*, should tell his *Comrades* when he returns to the West of *Scotland*, that *Truly* he paid *Material Obedience*

dience to his Officer when he was in *Flanders*; but his Conscience did not allow him to pay it *Formally*. His Neighbour would ask him, whether he marched in Rank and File; whether he Obedyed the word of Command; whether he Advanced and Retired, according to the usual *Signal*, and as his Officer ordered him to do? He answers, that all this he did; and then I believe his Neighbour might reasonably conclude that he paid *Formal* Obedience, according to the *Sacramentum Militare*, whether he himself thought so or not.

Moreover, the Author of the Apology never intended to Insinuate, no not by the remotest Consequence, that Mr. M. had not *University* Learning, though he presumed to play himself a little with a Distinction, which served the other to so little purpose, when applied to the Oath of *Canonical Obedience*. Nay, I am apt to believe that he thinks none of the Deprived Clergy so contemptible, as that they want to be informed of such a Distinction as *Materialiter* and *Formaliter*. But I leave the *Vindicator* to triumph a while over the Man of Straw that he himself raised, and beat again to the Ground.

All that the Author of the Apology said of *Presbyterians Ordinations*, was to

wave the Debate : for though we should not Approve them, we need not absolutely Condemn them. We may suspend our Judgment; at least, we need not be so forward to pronounce Sentence. We may leave them in that *Abyss* of Darkness, Novelty, and Uncertainty, where we found them. This, I hope, is no concession at all in their favour : nor is it necessary to come to any Peremptory Decision of that *Question*. Only to please the *Vindicator*, let him look again, and he will find no such Concession, either *Materially* or *Formally*, in any thing that is said by the Apologist. But our Author is always upon the Inquisitive Pin : He must find out our Opinions, whether we have a mind to let him know them or not : but this *Pragmatical* Humour obliges People frequently to hear things that are highly Disobliging, as well as Harsh and Unpleasant.

Whatever Plea's may be managed in defence of the *Ordinations* of Foreign Presbyterians from their *Necessities*; from the Unlawful *Conditions* required by Popish Bishops; from their preserving still in their *Rituals* the *Essentials* of *Ordination*, when they impose hands upon him that is Ordained; and from the Solemn words they pronounce when they convey *Formally* the Power of Administrating Sacraments,

craments, and of Absolving of Penitents, I say, whatever Pleas may be favourably used from these or such like *Topicks* in their Defence, I am still at liberty to wave the Debate, and leave it without engaging my self in any such Quarrel.

Nevertheless, the *Ordination* of the later *Scots Presbyterians* is left Naked and Destitute of all such Arguments. For they were under no necessity to Separate from their Bishops in the Isle of *Britain*. And it is very uncertain, whether they retain such *Solemn* and *Formal* words, when they impose Hands, as expressly declare that the Priestly Power of Administ'rating Sacraments, and of Absolving of *Penitents*, is then conveyed to him that is Ordained. And if there be no such Conveyance, there is no *Ordination*; and if the Words made use of do not *Formally* and *Plainly* signify such a Power, then there is no such Power conveyed; for where-ever there is any Power *formally* conveyed, there are words used *formally* signifying such a Power transmitted by him, who is in Authority, unto him that is Ordained. It is not my intention to Baptize a Child; that formally admits him within the enclosure of the Church, unless I pronounce the words of our *Saviour's* Institution. I do not pretend by this to in-

sinuate, that the *Solemn* words pronounc'd in *Ordination* are as **Unchangeable** as the Form of Baptism; yet in all Ages, amidst their *Accidental Variations*, the Power of Administrating *Sacraments*, and of Absolving of *Penitents*, was always retained in the Forms of the Church, under whatever significant Words, such a Power was formally transfer'd.

There is none of them that remembers by what *Solemn* Words the Power of a *Priest* was convey'd unto him, when he was said to be **Ordained**; besides, that there are many of their number in the West, who think *Imposition of hands* altogether **Unnecessary**. And its very odd to hear the *Vindicator* say (according to his Principles) that their Administrations are Null, if they are not truly **Ordained**: for at this rate he Nullifies all the Administrations of Mr. *Bruce*, sometime a Preacher at *Edinburgh*, who, for several Years, performed all Offices as a Minister, before he was **Ordained**. But I am not concerned in this, further than to put him in mind of a *Consequence* that he must necessarily revoke upon his own Principles. I am under no Obligation to Justifie their *Ordinations*. Let him make the best of them that he can. The Church is a Spiritual Society, and founded upon Spiritual Rules of Order and Discipline,

Discipline, from the beginning. This made it necessary to Authorize and Distinguish the Ministers of Religion from the body of the People, and to convey that Spiritual Power by certain Laws and Methods, and in such words as he who was Ordained, knew what Power he received, and from whom.

I am afraid, when all these things are duly consider'd, the *Presbyterian Ordinations* in our Country may be found a very Superficial *Charter*, a *Tenure* not worth the leaning to. And since *Ordination* (duly conveyed) is a *Fundamental*, and absolutely Necessary to the Being and Continuance of an *Organic Church*, I wish my Country-men would examine from whom the Presbyterians in our days had their *Ordination*. Whether they can prove, that the *Essentials* of *Ordination* have been inviolably observed when they were separated, to Officiate in Holy Things? Whether the Priestly Power was *Duly* and *Formally* conveyed in such Plain and Intelligible words, that they who gave it, and he who received it remembers exactly the Power that then was given, and the words in which it was conveyed? Whether, ever since the Presbyterians forbore to use the Method of *Geneve*, they have agreed among themselves upon any other

model of *Ordination*, in which are preserved any remains of those ancient Forms by which Priests have been distinguished from the People.

Def. Vind. p. 40.

Now the *Vindicator* tells me (to the great Reproach of the Episcopal Church) that he knew a Bishop in England, who said to a Presbyterian Minister, that he looked on him as no better than a Mechanic, because he wanted Episcopal Ordination.

For any thing I know, (or the *Vindicator* either) the Bishop was in the right. Perhaps he knew him *Materialiter* to be a Mechanic, though *Formaliter*, especially upon Sundays he appeared another thing. This is a Question altogether separated from the concern of Foreign Presbyterians, of whom I say nothing: I leave them to the Infinite Goodness of God, who makes Abatements for those difficult Circumstances, in which we may be placed upon Earth, and therefore I entirely wave that Question. As for the present Presbyterians of *Scotland*, it is not easie to name any colourable pretence to Justifie their *Ordinations*. Let them look to it seriously, who continue in their Communion, whether they can Administer the Sacraments who never had any Authoritative Mission? Whether they can Ministerially absolve *Penitents*, who were never duly Distinguish-

ed

ed from the People to Officiate? Whether such can duly transmit this *Ordination* to others? The Question is not simply, Whether Presbyters can Ordain that are truly such; but whether those, who have no Evidence of their being Presbyters, can confer *Ordination*? If they say that they derive their Commission from the People to whom they Preach, then we must know who invested the People with that Power. And it must be made Evident, not only that the People had such a Power, but that they conveyed it to *them* in due Form: Neither of which will ever appear.

What our Author hath concerning the Discipline of the Church, is not worth considering. If any thing be said against *their* Discipline, and the Methods of *their* Inquisition, he then insinuates that this is to declaim against all Discipline in general: But one may very well wish the ancient Discipline to be restored, and yet at the same time wish that the Presbyterian Government had never been heard of. He asks me, *what that Discipline is, which is not the same with theirs, or is not a great deal more strict and severe.* I tell him that I never found fault with their Discipline, for its being strict, but for being factiously Pragmatical, and endlessly Inquisitive, and
Def. Vind. P. 17, 18.
from

from its having no tendency, (as by them managed) to Edifie the Christian Church, or to reclaim wicked People; therefore would I have the ancient Strict Discipline revived, which had all those happy Effects. But this is his way, when we signifie our Displeasure against their Discipline, he immediately concludes, that we are against all Discipline in general, and the *Strictness* of it especially: and this is a very popular *Topic* when he declaims amongst the *Sisters* against those Wicked Men, who would pull down the Government of *Christ's* own Institution, and the Discipline of his House, and would gladly Indulge all Wickedness and Immorality. They are the Enemies of God and all true Religion. They know nothing of *the workings of the Spirit of God upon their own hearts*. And in a Word, all this warfare between the Malignants and the Godly, is nothing else but the Opposition between *the Seed of the Serpent and the Seed of the Woman*.

Def. Vind. p. 17,
18. Again, he saith, that his Adversary hath the *Brow to wish that the ancient Discipline might be restored*. And was not this an extraordinary flight of Impudence, to disparage the Presbyteriar Discipline, and to wish that instead of it we had the Ancient Discipline restored

But

But he tells us, that the *Ancient Discipline was more strict*; and then the Insinuation is, that we only oppose their Discipline, because of its Strictness. But it is impossible for him to forbear such Inferences: for his business is more to propagate Libells against the Clergy, and to represent them as pleading for Wickedness and Vice, rather than to return Sober Answers, else he had upon this occasion considered Bishop *Bramhall's* View of the New Discipline, to which he was referred, and not have treated his Adversary so Maliciously, as to represent him pleading either for Remiss Discipline, or no Discipline at all, which I would advise him to forbear hereafter; *Nam si pergat dicere quæ vult, audiet quæ non vult.*

I now call to mind some other Lashes Def. Vind p. 16. of his Pen against the Apologist, upon the head of *Non-Resistance*. And he applauds his Wit, that he forbears to debate the Question *untill he understand it better*, and know the state of the Controversie: So he concludes, that he did not know it. Why then was not he so Charitable, as to state the Controversie more Clearly, since he was at the pains to instruct his Adversary, that there was such a distinction as *Materialiter* and *Formaliter*.

maliter. Might not he drop some of his Ink to give him better Notions of *Resistance* and *Non-Resistance* than he had before? And yet though he thinks that his Adversary understood not the State of the Controversie, he tells us, that his Opinion was *Intelligibly enough* expressed; and if so, what ground of Complaint against him, that he waded a Controversie, in which the Presbyterians of *Scotland* are too much concerned. And his Adversary stated one Branch of it fairly, and proved to a Demonstration that the Presbyterians are Rebels in the strictest Sense, because they actually were in Arms against the Laws, and upon frequent occasions resisted the Unquestionable Authority of King and Parliament. So far we are very sure the Author of the Apology understood the State of the Controversie: and the *Vindicator* thought it convenient not to trouble himself with that Argument, because it may prove somewhat Stiff and Inflexible. They were in Arms against the Authority of those Parliaments that have been Valid, Legal, Unexceptionable in their first Original and Intrinsic Constitution, both as to the Authority by which they were conven'd, and the Members of which they were composed. They were Parliaments

liaments which had neither Extrinsic nor Intrinsic Nullities. In a word, the Authority of those Parliaments was resisted by them, that they themselves could form no Objections against: such as were agreeable in all regards to our Original Constitution and Hereditary *Monarchy*.

As for the other Branch of this Controversie, whether the King of *Scots* may be Resisted even by the whole Body of the People *Collective* or *Representative*. The Apologist told the *Vindicator*, that when both of them stood on a Level, he should declare his mind plainly. This was enough one would think, to satisfy him in a thing that his Adversary declined to be too Positive and Decisive. Now, whether we stand on a Level or not, I tell him that our Laws determine that the King ought not to be Resisted, neither by the *Collective* nor *Representative* Body of the People. And if the *Primores Regni*, (whom the *Vindicator* names) or the Body of the People make Steps that are against the Law, in things that so nearly concern the quiet of the Nation, they know very well what name such Practices deserve, in the Sense of the Law it self. The Laws are the great Security of our Peace and Property,

perty, and however they may be at sometimes Unjust and Tyranical, yet they ought to be taken down with the same Pomp and Ceremony that they were advanced unto being.

If I cannot invade the Person or Goods of my Neighbour otherwise than in the Method that the Law allows and Prescribes; pray, may I invade the King without either Law or Authority? Is he in a worse condition than any of the Subjects, whom I cannot touch otherwise than as the Law directs? If resisting of the King, was a thing so Allowable and Necessary, as it is frequent in their Practices, why did not the Laws of *Scotland* plainly declare in what cases the King is to be resisted, and by whom, and how? And since the Property of my Neighbour is guarded by many Laws, Rules, and Restrictions, so that I cannot meddle with him but according to the Regulations of the Law, it's wonderful to think that any body may meddle with the King, where there is no Law to regulate his motions; especially since the Shaking, Disturbing, or Unsettling the Rights of the *Monarchy*, overturns Nations and Kingdoms, and involves them in a thousand disasters: whereas the wronging my Neighbour is no more than
the

the injury done to a particular Man. Now its very odd to say, that the Law should be so tender of Individuals and private Subjects, but have no regard to the King, upon whose Safety the whole body of the People depends. Therefore suppose it lawful to resist the King, either by the *Primores Regni* (as our Author faintly and timerously insinuates) or by the *West Country People at Pentland Hills, or Bothwel Bridge*; I hope in that case they can name the Laws that invest them with that power of resisting: For the disturbing the King, is of greater consequence to the *Commonwealth*, than the Robbing a private Man upon the Highway. Now if the Laws gave no Rules to regulate the resistance of our Kings, in that case, I say, the Laws do suppose it altogether unlawful. So much I affirm is very plain upon the Supposition, that there were no express Laws against resistance.

The Doctrine of *Nonresistance* truly stated and explained, runs the same Fate of other Evangelick Precepts, *i.e.* Flesh and Blood cannot receive them, but the more they are Practic'd, the more Christianity recommends it self to the World. And the Church ought to be more terrible by her Spiritual Weapons, than by her Carnal;

nal; when she makes use of the last, she becomes weak and Contemptible, and being diffident of Gods everlasting Arm, she trusts to little inventions of her own. But if she prevail against Heresie, Infidelity, or Wickedness, (as the Primitive Church did) she must betake her to the Methods of Patience, Fortitude, and Sincerity, by which alone she would overawe all her Enemies.

To oppose the Church when she Fights by Spiritual Weapons of Christian Doctrine and Stedfastness, is to proclaim War against Heaven; and God can easily defeat and infatuate all Earthly Powers that struggle against his Ambassadors and Servants. Therefore I reckon that the Church is always safer by following closely the Rules of her Original Constitution, than by all her secular Wiles and Stratagems; the Experience of all Ages confirms this. We believe that the Gospel which we Preach is reveal'd by God, and he will defend it; and there is no need of our *Violence* to secure the Church. Let us live according to the Precepts of the Gospel, and then in defiance of all opposition, she will be terrible as an Army with Banners.

God gave the Apostles no Rules as to the managements of this World, but he commanded

commanded them, and their Successors to Preach the Gospel in the Face of all Danger and Persecution, and whatever be the event, we are very sure, that the Christian Religion shall flourish in its Faith and Morals, more then when we lean to the crooked inventions of Men.

If the People are allowed upon all occasions, when either they are oppress'd, or pretend it, to resist Authority, then all the Precepts of Meekness and Patience are in vain; for what King can grapple with the whole Community, or the Major part of them? If they resist his Edicts, what does he signifie? If they may do it in the case of Oppression, they ought to do it; for we have no Precepts of Meekness and Patience, to suffer those Evils which by our own Power we may lawfully remove; in that case Meekness is Cowardice and Pusillanimity, rather than Patience and Fortitude.

Another thing very remarkable amongst the Presbyterians of *Scotland* is this, that they abhor and cast off all established Forms and Rules in the Worship of God; nay so Zealous they have been since the Revolution against these, that they turn out the Episcopal Clergy out of their *Living*s, if they retain any of the ancient Forms, tho' never so short,
V Catholicks,

Catholick, or Orthodox. And this forbearance of all such is enjoined, (forsooth) under the Notion of Uniformity, *i. e.* they must desert the Practice of all Christian Churches, and then they are capable to be incorporated into Presbyterian Societies. It is matter of Astonishment to hear, that the Episcopal Clergy are enjoined to forbear the *Lord's Prayer*, *Reading of the Holy Scriptures* in their Assemblies, *the Apostolick Creed*, and the *Doxology*; And are these the things to be laid aside in Order to their Union, with the Presbyterians? What a sad condition is the Church brought unto! That Form of Prayer must be banished, which is most perfect in it self, and recommended by the Uniform Practice of the whole Catholick Church, enjoined by our *Saviour* to his Disciples, and retained in the publick Offices of all Christians reformed and unreformed, and formerly used by the Presbyterians themselves, tho' now they keep at such a distance from it, as if our *Saviour* had expressly forbidden it. These things are grievous in their Nature, and have no Tendency but to promote Atheism and the Contempt of all things sacred. When the Madness and Dreams of idle People are so severely impos'd for *Laws* and Rules of *Uniformity*, when the humour of Schism

Schism is so high, that the Holy Scriptures must not be read in their publick Assemblies as heretofore; and when their Children are Baptized, the Parents are not allowed to know into what Religion or *Faith* they are initiated; none of the Antient *Creeds* must be repeated at Baptism; they hear their *Speakers* Discourse a great many things of the *Westminster* Confession of Faith, and the *Covenants* of the Kirk of *Scotland*, that a great many of the Poor People have no other Notions of Christianity, than that is a strict Engagement: to be a *Covenanter*.

Nay, so unfixed and variable are they in thole *Appearances* they call their *Publick Worship*, that there are not two of them in the Nation, who follow the same Rule; and no Man knows *now*, what shall be his own Method within an Hour after, but as he varies from others, so the same Man must every Day differ from himself, according to all the possible changes of Humor, Age, Health, Disease, Temper, or Disposition.

I know the *Vindicator*, and such as he, will object, that the Episcopal Church of *Scotland*, after the Restoration of *Ch. II.* had not an established Liturgy; this is for the matter true; and we know very well to whom we owe that Blemish and

Infelicity. But our Clergy came as near the best Liturgies in their publick Prayers as might be, and compos'd Prayers for their own use, such as they seldom varied from, especially in the Administration of the Sacraments, they took care, by the *Plainness, Gravity, and Coherence* of their Words, that the People might not be left in the Dark, as to their meaning, nor puzzled with various Ramblings every Day, such as have no order or dependence, than what is caused by the heat of their Animal Spirits; and so for the matter our Clergy had a Liturgy, thò perhaps not so full, Comprehensive, and regular, as what might be established by Authority.

Thef. Salmur.

I do not here enter into any Dispute against those who may think it unlawful to serve God by an Established form in the publick Worship; they are a sort of Creatures that we know not how to Attack; they are proof against all Argument, and must needs think themselves wiser than the whole Christian Church. They are sufficiently exposed by the Writings of Foreign *Presbyterians*, as well as the *Divines* of the Church of England. The Question is, whether the *Extemporary* way be preferable to a Liturgy, fix'd and established by the Church. Our *Presbyterians*

byterians prefer the first ; I chuse rather to recommend a well compos'd Liturgy in the words of *Calvin*, than in my own ; *quod ad formulam precum & rituum Ecclesiasticorum, valde probo ut certa illa extet,* Epist. Calvin. Amstel, 1667. *a qua pastoribus discedere in functione sua non liceat,* this was his declared Opinion and Doctrine : Now let us hear his Reasons, first, *ut consulatur quorundam simplicitati & imperitiæ.* And are the great things of God's solemn Worship to be left to the Wisdom and Discretion of every private Administrator ? Is there any thing that is a better Evidence of the Piety and Gravity of a Nation, than the Solemnities of public Worship ? every *Priest* is not wise enough to manage an Affair of such vast Importance. * And tho' he should be very wise, yet at all times he is not in the same Temper, and it is not reasonable that the Worship of God should be less decent when his intellectuals are + clouded, than when he was in perfect Health. The Spiritual necessities of the People, ought at all times to be equally provided for, and therefore the Wisdom of the Christian Church never left an Affair of so great Consequence to the + uncertain variations of any Man's Humour ; so this first Reason holds as long as Human Nature continues in the same Condition that now it is in. His

His next Reason is, *ut ita constet omnium inter se Ecclesiarum consensus.* And if Uniformity be so valuable a thing, so strong a Ligament of Order and Discipline, and so absolutely necessary to support the Church against the insultings of Atheism and Infidelity, then this Reason at least proves the infinite Advantages of established Forms, above their extemporary Effusions. It is wonderful to me, why the Presbyterians (who have no Uniformity amongst themselves) should be so troublesome to their Neighbours upon this head! But they may pretend, that all that they require is no more than a *Negative Uniformity*, that is to say, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and Doxology, + and the Reading of the Scriptures must not be used. And what a sad thing must it be to part with the publick *Tessera's* of *Uniformity*, to preserve *Uniformity* it self.

His third Reason is, *ut obviam eatur desultoria quorundam levitati qui novationes quasdam affectant.* And this is as good a reason as any of the former; for Men are not only weak, but love to vent their own Conceits. Now if the publick Worship of God be of the highest Consequence, (as the wisest Men of all Ages, always thought) and if Human Nature be

be now, what it formerly hath been, then Calvin's Arguments for Liturgies are *un-⁺answerable*.

I know the *Vindicator* will say, that Def. 17th p 15 this is the Language of one that is *blinded with Superstition*; but then, he and I have not the same Notion of Superstition. I look upon the Men of his way, to be the most *Superstitious* People upon Earth: ⁺ they declaim against things in their own Nature innocent and useful, as if they were forbidden by God. When we represent to our selves the *Duty* as one that is pleased with the imaginary Notions that we groundlessly entertain of things, this is the Superstition that Poisons the Soul and all its Faculties. When we say that such a thing is forbidden by God only because we forbid it our selves, this is to *Teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*; but to regulate Actions that are indifferent in their Nature, according to the prudent Determination of our *Superiours*, cannot fall under that Censure, else all Societies, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, must be involved in the guilt. When we say things are unlawful that are not unlawful, when we prefer Human Institutions to the Commandments of God, when we overvalue things beyond their own *Nature, Digni-*

ty, and Order, in which God hath placed them; when we esteem the *Means* more than the *End*, and separate the Ecclesiastical Laws from their *Relation* and *Subserviency*, to the Laws of God; when our Thoughts and Notions of things are so confus'd that we mistake their *Subordination* one unto another, and Practice according to such Notions, then we put *Light for Darkness*, and *Darkness for Light*. Our best performances must needs be tainted with Folly and Superstition, and we Worship God, not according to the Dictates of true Reason or Revelation, but according to the dark *Idea* which we form to our selves; this is Superstition in its true Colours.

Its very observable, that when S. Paul reproves the Superstition of Hereticks, and judaizing Christians, he places it much in *their Negative Scrupulosity*. They were taught by Seducers to mix with their own Religion the fantastick Austerities of other Sects, as if our abstinence from moderate and lawful Pleasures and satisfactions, were things in their own Nature very acceptable to God, *forbidding to Marry, and commanding to abstain from Meats*. They condemn'd things in their own Nature, lawful and useful, as if they were dangerous and hurtful, and taught that

Coloss. 2. 21, 22,
23.

1 Tim. 4. 3.

that those Abstinencies had in them such intrinsick Excellencies, as made up a great part of true Religion. And this kind of Superstition was much more plausible than that which prevails in our Days; yet both of them agree in their Original and fundamental Principle, in that, under the Notion of Religion, they keep at a distance from things Excellent and useful, as if God had forbidden them. That *Negative* Superstition which prevailed amongst the Pagans and Judaizing Christians, had in it (as *S. Paul* informs us) a shew of Wisdom, Humility, and Mortification, and a Zealous forwardness in Religion. Tho' as they managed those *Abstinences* and Severities, they became the greatest Obstacles to true Religion, since they were imposed as things more valuable in their Nature, than the Love of God and our Neighbour; but that Superstition which prevails in our Days amongst our *Schismatics*, is of a more dangerous Consequence; they Condemn those Solemnities of Religion and Ecclesiastical Constitutions, as things in their Nature *unlawful* and *Superstitious*, that have a direct Tendency to promote Religion in all its most Excellent branches; and to Condemn such things as forbidden by God, which are wisely contrived to promote

Coloss. 2. 21, 22.

promote the true ends of Religion, is no less than a great step towards Atheism. The one and the other consist in their *Negatives*, (*touch not, taste not, handle not.*) Which agrees exactly with the superstitious Fooleries of our Days; *you must not say, you must not sing, you must not observe a Holy-day.* The one placed much of their Religion in their *forbearance* of innocent things; but the other value themselves upon their rejecting *excellent and useful* Constitutions. The first was more plausible, because they pretended to *mortifie* the Flesh; and *Abstinence*, if discreetly used, (and with Subordination to better things,) had a Tendency to so good an end, but when overvalu'd and not duly placed, became Superstitious. But the latter sort of *Negatives* that rejects the Constitutions of the Church, in things *indifferent*, implies a direct Stubbornness against all Authority, and introduces the Contempt of publick Worship, *Atheism* and *Scepticism*, and a boundless Latitude of Morals.

Let the serious Reader consider, which of the two is worse: yet they have the Impudence to charge all Christian Churches with *Superstition*, when their own Practices are *Superstitious* to a degree beyond Comparifon. The *Superstition* which

which *S. Paul* reprov'd in the Primitive Hereticks, had in it a *shew of Wisdom and Humility*: their *Abstinences and Severities* were *Theatrical Performances*, which they thought recommended them to God, more than Obedience to the Rules of his own Institution; nay, they Taught that the *peculiar Doctrines* of their Sect, was a more perfect Rule of Life, than the *Gospel* it self, and therefore they preferr'd their own *Schemes and Inventions* to it; this is that which the Apostle calls being *subject to Ordinances and living after the Commandments, and Doctrines of Men*. By which are not meant the *Rituals* appointed by lawful Authority, to preserve the Solemnities of Worship in Order and Decency, but rather the *fantastick Innovations of Seducers*, who had no Authority at all; who Taught the People that there was more true Perfection and Sanctity in their own *Schemes*, than in obeying the Precepts of *Christ* and his Apostles. How different is this from the Practice of the *Christian Church*, who hath appointed all her *Rituals* in a direct Subordination and Subserviency to promote the great ends of Religion; and if we consider her Constitutions without this *Relation* and *Dependence*, we mistake their Nature and Tendency.

Those

Those *Primitive Hereticks* thought, that their nicer observances were more pleasing unto God, than Faith and Obedience. They represented him to themselves, as a *Peevish* and *Angry Beeing*, and and sooner pleased with their *unreasonable* and *singular* Impositions, than with the most *significant* expressions of true Religion; they made those Austerities *parts* of their Religion, as things more agreeable to the *Divine Nature*. If we consider the Exercise of *Fasting*, as a subservient *mean* to advance greater Purity, and to keep the body in *subjection* to the *spirit*, then it is approved by God and the Practice of all *civiliz'd* Nations; but when we look upon it as a thing pleasing unto God, separated from any such *Relation* and *Tendency*, we mistake it widely; for in it self its neither *good* nor *bad*, but as it is determined to either by its *circumstances*.

Nay, which is more, the *Rituals* and *Solemnities* of *Worship*, which have been appointed by God himself, are not acceptable to him, if they are not performed to advance things more excellent in their Nature, than all *external Ceremonies* can be. *To obey is better than Sacrifice, and to hearken than the Fat of Rams.* And all Constitutions of whatever kind. that

that are not employed to advance the Love of God, and our Neighbour, are abused, and if we think to recommend ourselves unto God, by such *publick* or *private* observances, whether they are imposed by *Divine* or Ecclesiastical Authority, *we deceive our selves, and the Truth is not in us.*

How Religious did the *Pharisee* appear S. Matth. 12. 10. unto himself, who asked our Saviour, *if it was Lawful to heal on the Sabbath Day*; he thought that the nicer Observation of the letter of the Law, concerning the *Sabbath*, or the stricter Adherence to some later Rules invented by the *Pharisees*, was of greater moment and more pleasing unto God, than the safety of Mankind, for whom the *Sabbath* it self was Originally appointed; this was to overturn the whole frame of Religion, to place things uppermost, which by their Original Institution were established in the lowest Rank; to think that it was more agreeable to the infinite goodness of God to forbear the healing of a Man, (because of *the Sabbath-day*) than to restore him to his perfect Health, was altogether unbecoming the Dignity of our Nature, and much more the Honour of that God whom we Worship. I have known some *Superstitious* People, to whom the most excellent

† cellent and the most comfortable things became *terrible* and *uneasy*; they represented God to their Fancy, as if he were all *Thunder* and *Indignation*; this made them approach him with a slavish and and *Superstitious* fear, to that degree, that they would not venture to break open a Letter (upon a *Sunday*) addressed to them from a Friend, in the remotest part of the World; yet they would bitterly declaim against the Observation of *Christmas* and *Easter*. In the mean time they considered not, that the Letter might be Address'd from one who then wanted their Assistance and Conduct, their Advice and Charity in things of the greatest Consequence to Soul and Body: And to relieve him in such a difficult strait, resembled the *unconfi'd* goodness of God; Whereas my forbearance to touch the Seal, for fear of breaking the Sabbath, resembles the mean Notions of a Superstitious *Jew*, † whom our Saviour confuted by *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *Miracle*.

† *Superstition* is not only *blind*, *unreasonable*, and *Confus'd*, but it leads also directly unto *Atheism*, and by the Power of Prejudice and Faction, it makes a Man despise the Omniscience of God, and to venture upon the most daring Impieties. Thus the *Covenanters*, when they were

in their full *Career* against the ancient Constitution of *Church* and *State*, with *Hands lifted up to Heaven*, abjur'd the *Primitive Stations*. But if you should ask most of those sullen Creatures what they meant by the *Stations* that they abjur'd in the *Covenant*, they must needs tell you, that truly they knew nothing of them; yet they renounce them by their solemn Oath as things unagreeable to their *Reformation*; and perhaps there are very few in their *General Assembly*, (who only had their Education amongst the *Presbyterians*,) can tell you to this Day, what was meant by the *Stations* of the *Primitive Church*. It is difficult to name any thing more *Superstitious* amongst the *Pagans*, or of more dangerous Consequence than such a *brutal* and *Atheistical* Practice. For the *Stations* of the first *Christians* were the most *Heavenly Exercises*, and most agreeable to our Religion, and had a Natural Tendency to disengage our Souls from the World; and in their general Nature were nothing else than those *Fasts* that were joyned with the strictest attendance upon publick Prayers, and the other Devotions of the Church. To take our solemn Oath, that we will never countenance, nor be present at such Exercises of *Mortification*, *Humility*, and

*Vid. Albaspin
de veteribus Ec-
clesiæ ritibus.*

self

Self Denial, as were the *Stations* of the first Christians, is (in my humble Opinion) not only *Superstitious* but *Atheistical*: for the Body of the People had no true Notion of what they meant, nor did they ever enquire into their Nature, + but blindly swore what they were taught by their *Leaders*; so they swore neither in *Truth*, nor *Righteousness*, nor *Judgment*.

Bigotry and *Superstition* have betray'd the World unto greater Follies and Disasters than any other thing that can be named; Nay, they are the greatest Obstacles to our Peace here, and happiness hereafter. True Reason and Revelation ought to direct our approaches towards God: When we Worship him at a Venture, we may happen to perform some outward acts of Obedience; but being destitute of Reason they are void of Life, and consequently unagreeable to the Nature of the Living God, who is himself all *Light* and *Life*, and abhors those Sacrifices that bear no Impressions of his Nature and Perfections. When we Worship (as our *Saviour* said to the *Woman of Samaria*) we know not what; when we approach him in the Dark, not knowing who he is; when we draw a Picture of him in our own Mind like
our

our selves, easily Pleased and Displeas'd with little Things and unaccountable Trifles. When we forget that all the *Ritual* part of Religion hath no other end than to promote the *Moral*. When the Ceremonies of Worship (whether they are of Divine or Humane Constitution) Oppress and Devour the *Vitals* of Devotion, that they were originally design'd to preserve, then we change true *Piety* unto *Superstition*, and we mistake the Nature of true Religion, and under the Pretence of Zeal, we heighten and inflame our Passions, we give loose Reins to our most unruly Appetites, and we think that we do God good Service when we venture upon the most Barbarous Actions. In a Word, *Superstition* is a Piece of *blind* Service, and therefore *unacceptable*; a *Bastard-kind* of *Worship*, that proceeds from *Pusillanimity*, and *Unreasonable Fear*; whereas *Love* and *Light* are the *Essential* Ingredients of that *Worship* with which God is pleas'd, and by which his Image is restor'd in the Souls of Men.

Irregular desires become more *Obstinate* the more they are shelter'd under the name of Religion, then they become *Ungovernable* when the Authority of Heaven is pretended to *Direct* and *Animate*

the Corruption of our Nature. Our greatest Zeal must therefore be employ'd against that which is unquestionably evil. The Jews would not enter *Pilate's Hall*, because it was the *Preparation*. It was not possible to have more *Tender*, *Delicate*, and *Nice* Consciences, yet in the mean time they were consulting the *Death of the Lord of Life*. The *Bloody Enthusiasts*, in our own Country, who combin'd to Murther a Venerable Old Man upon the High-way, would not part from the House where they had made their appointment, until first they sung *Psalms*, and *Blasphemously* perverted several places of Scripture to serve *their Conspiracy*. This is the same Folly and Madness for the Nature of it, that the *Poet* so *Pleasantly* (nay, I may say so *Theologically*) ridicules in the *Egyptians*.

Dr. Sharp,
Archbishop of
St. Andrews.

Juven. sat. 15. *Lanatis animalibus abstinet omnis
Mensa, nefas illic factum jugulare capellæ;
Carnibus humanis vesci licet.*

And in the same place he gives us an instance of two different *Seçts*, who hated the Religion of one another extreamly, and upon a certain Occasion fought desperately;

— *Aspiceres*

— *Aspiceres jam cuncta per agmina vultus
Dimidios, alias facies, & biamia ruptis
Ossa genis, plenos oculorum sanguine pugnos:*

Here was a Scuffle with a Witness; they fought for their Religion, they were Martyrs for their little *Idols*, when they only pleased *their own* Fury and Passion: and we see this folly exactly copied by many Christians. They contend warmly for their *own* Opinions, and they think that by so doing they are the only *Favourites* of Heaven, and most beloved of God. *Self* is the *Idol* that Mankind bow to, it is the *Root* of all *Superstition* and *Impiety*; and therefore our *Saviour* gave us this Command in the first place *to deny our selves*. When *Our* wills are Subdued to the *Will* of God, then Religion hath its true Conquest in the Soul. If we struggle for the *Opinions* and *Fancies* that are but of yesterday, in Opposition to the Doctrine and Practices of the *Catholic Church*, we believe our selves rather than the *Gospel*, we are *Superstitious* in the strictest Notion; and to set up our *own* Decrees against the *Suffrage* of so many Ages, is *Arrogance* and *Vanity* in the highest Sense.

But when we defend the *Church* and her *Catholic* Constitutions, we do not

propagate *our own peculiar* Opinions. There is nothing in this undertaking that is contrary to the Humility of the *Gospel*: for the Doctrines and Discipline of the *Church* are not *Ours*, *i.e.* not lately invented by us, but received in all Ages; and in Defending them we cannot be said to serve the ends of *Pride, Vanity,* or *Superstition*. We do not distinguish our selves from the Croud, nor do we draw upon us the Eyes of Men, by going out of the Common Road: On the contrary, it is the fatal Disease of all *Sectaries* to contend for their own *Novelties* more fiercely than they would do for the four *Evangelists*: and they impose their new *Chimeras*, with greater rigour upon others, than *Faith, Mercy, the Love of God and our Neighbour*.

I have upon this occasion discoursed freely of *Superstition*, because we are frequently charged with it by our *Adversaries*; and I leave it to the *Impartial* Reader to examine, whether this their Accusation be not very *Blind* and *Disingenuous*, when he views the Nature and Effects of *Superstition*, and the present Practices of the *Presbyterians*.

They pretend to hide nothing from the People; and indeed their *Condescensions*

sions to popular Fancies, are very Servile and Unbecoming : and most of them (whose good Opinion they court,) continue still in their profound Ignorance, even when they bitterly declaim against all others ; especially those who do not tamely submit to their Dictates. It is very sad to observe, how much well-meaning People may be Imposed upon, and Deluded by the *Sound* of words they do not understand : and this (one would think) is a very dangerous Branch of *Superstition*. The very *Catechism* that they teach the People, is (for the most part) so contrived, that none can understand it but they who have had their Education in the *Universities*, being composed to serve the *Hypothesis* of a certain Order of *School-men*, rather than adapted to the Capacities of the People. It is true, they amuse their Followers with the Opinion of knowing more than their Neighbours ; yet this knowledge is not only *Imaginary* and *Superficial*, but also very dangerous to true Christian Practice and Morals. They are at great pains to lodge so many words in their Memories ; yet those very words convey no *Ideas* to their mind, but such as are *Confus'd* and *Unintelligible*. This might be instanced in several Questions,

in the Assemblies *Shorter and Larger Catechism*, which I humbly Judge impossible for the People to understand, unless
 + they had been Educated from their Infancy in the Contentious and Artificial Language of the *Schools*. I do not now consider whether the Doctrine contained in their *Catechism* be *Orthodox* or not ; I only say, that it is impossible for the People to understand it.

I name but one Question, which the *Catechist* thus proposes,

Wherein consists the Sinfulness of that Estate whereinto man fell ?

The Answer is as follows,

The Sinfulness of that Estate whereinto Man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first Sin, the want of Original Righteousness, and the Corruption of his whole Nature, which is commonly call'd Original Sin, together with all actual Transgressions which proceed from it.

If we view the several Particulars of which this Answer consists, we meet with nothing in it but what is very *Dark*, and altogether beyond the Comprehension of *Illiterate* People: Nay, though they were *Learn'd*, yet unless they are acquainted with the Language of the *Schools*, they cannot penetrate into the meaning of this Answer ; it pre-supposes,
 that

that the *Person Catechiz'd* is well Versed in the *Systematic Learning*, and that he hath read the common Places of *Theology*, as they are ranged by the *Jesuits*, or those among the *Reformed*, who built too much on their *Foundations*. And can we reasonably think, that a Man, who never convers'd with them, nor their Books, can have any distinct notion of what is wrapt up in the Clouds of that Unknown Language: Must every *Plowman* be acquainted with all the *Barbarous Distinctions* of the *Schools*? And if not, then the *Presbyterian Catechism* is so contrived, as to feed their *Pride* and *Vanity*, and yet they are left in the most *Lamentable Ignorance*.

The first Particular that makes up this Answer, is, *De reatu primi peccati primi Hominis*: The Next is as difficult as the Former, *De privatione Justitie Originalis*; and the English Words, in which we have it, leaves it undetermin'd, whether they intend to Express by it *Privatio* or *Negatio*, or a more *General Phrase* than either of them. And is this Language likely to be understood by the Body of the People? The third Particular, is as much above their Level, as any of the other two; for it seems to Insinuate, that the *Original rectitude*

of Humane Nature, was not only *Bruised*, *Weakned*, and *Distorted*, contrary to its Original Byass, but rather wholly *Destroyed*; and that there are no *Remains* of the Divine Image left upon the Souls of Men. But these three Particulars do not (all of them together) make up (in the design of the *Catechist*) the *Sinfulness* of that *Estate* whereinto Man fell: There is a Fourth added, which is, *all actual Transgressions* which proceed from it. So that he that answers, must recollect all these together in his own Mind, before he attains any true Notion of what is asked in this Question; and withal have some tollerable skill in the *Metaphysicks*.

When we look upon the Body of the People, as engaged in the Various incumbrances of *Humane* Life, and how little they are acquainted with the *Niceties* of the *Schools*; we must needs conclude, that they that composed this *Catechism*, designed it rather as the *Badge* of their Party than as the Instructions of the *Faithful*. The Knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ ought not to be mix'd with, nor deliver'd in *Metaphysical* Niceties. The Publick Catechisms of the Church should be formed in the most *Unexceptionable* words, such as are agreeable to the Principles of Natural Religion, and the
great

great Articles of our Faith, that are received amongst all Christians: but when the People are instructed only in those nicer *Shibboleths*, that the divided Fraternities have invented to distinguish themselves from one another; when they please themselves with such words as *Monks*, and ill natur'd *Zealots* pitch'd upon as the *Characteristic* of their Societies: This is nothing else than to lift up a Banner for *Faction*, *Ignorance*, and *Superstition*. They are taught by their *Leaders* to bawl against the *Ancient* methods of the *Christian* Church: and that, which they set up in Opposition to it, leads them naturally to *Pride* and *Enthusiasm*. The *Christian* Religion was design'd to be the Religion of all Nations, and therefore it must be taught in the Plainest Language, such as all Men may Understand: This was the Practice of our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*; they delivered the *Heavenly* Message in the Current *Idiom* of the *Jews*. There can be nothing more foolishly *Superstitious* than to be tickled and pleased with words that we do not understand: they may make some Impression upon the Imagination, yet they convey no solid Nourishment to the mind. This is the Case of our *Zealots*: they are wonderfully delighted
with

with such *Modes* of speaking, as put their Animal Spirits in motion, even when their *Mind*, their *Reason*, and their *Judgment*, are altogether unacquainted with the Force and Victories of *true Religion*.

This charge may be fairly managed against *their Catechism* in General, as well as that Particular Question which I mentioned. Their Homilies to the People run in the same Strain: and the Bigots of *their Party*, are so much in love with the sound of certain Words, that they think they understand them, even when they have no clear *Notion* or *Idea* conveyed to their Mind. This is very accountable to such as are acquainted with the frame of *Humane Nature*, the Delusions of an *Animal Religion*, the gross Ignorance of the *Populace*, and how few there are that have either Skill or Courage, to examine the things that are in *Vogue*, by the *Principles* of *true Reason*; yet, amidst all *their lamentable Errors* and *Mistakes*, they are *highly conceited* of their own Knowledge, and they have the *Vanity* to accuse all *Christian Churches* of *Superstition*, when *they themselves* are *Irrecoverably* tainted with that Disease.

It is very probable, that if the *Vindicator* take these Paragraphs of mine to task, he will most Zealously undertake the Defence of all that *Orthodox* Stuff that is contained in their Publick Catechisms, and write out a whole *System* to confute his Adversary. But that which I consider at present, is not whether *they* are *Orthodox* or *Erroneous*, but whether the People understand *their* Doctrine or not, or the *Metaphysical* Niceties and Language in which *their* Catechism is composed. *They* keep them in perpetual Darkness and Ignorance: and when *he* names any one Man, that is *altogether illiterate* (as many of the People are supposed to be) that understand *their* Catechism, then I may be persuaded to retract much of what I charge them with.

Pursuant to this design of keeping *them* in the Dark, *they* forbid the *Scriptures* of the *Old* and *New* Testament to be read in *their* *Publick Assemblies*. In the beginning of the *Reformation* the People were over-joy'd, when the *Bible* was translated into their own Language: but now the *Canonical Scriptures* as well as the *Apocryphal*, are laid aside from *Publick Use*. This is such a bold stroke of *Atheism* and *Enthusiasm*, that it must needs be *Scandalous* to all *Christian Societies*,

cieties, as well as *contrary* to the Practice of the *Church* in all Ages. How can the People be acquainted with the History of the *Gospel*, unless the *Holy Scriptures* are read *Publickly* in the *Church*; especially, considering that *they* have banish'd that short *Abstract* of *Christian Fundamentals* contained in the *Apostles Creed*. Many of the People cannot read at all, and they that can, neglect the *Scriptures* but too much in *Private*. Must they banish the *Oracles* of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, to make way for *their Extemporary Effusions*? If such Practices be not exposed, it is not possible to preserve the People from *down-right Atheism*, nor the *Protestant Religion* from the *Reproaches* and *Insultings* of its *Open* and *Avowed Enemies*. And though we have no *Communion* with such *Licentious Dreamers*, yet their *Neighbourhood* expose us to the *Uncharitable Assaults* of our *Enemies*, as if *we* as well as *they* had shaken off all *Communion* with the *Ancient, Primitive, and Apostolic Church*. When *their Publick Worship* changes its *Appearances*, as oft as the *Seasons* of the *Year*, we cannot but lament the *Condition* of poor People, who are *Enslaved* to their *Unreasonable Dictates*, always *Learning*, and never able to come to the
Knowledge

knowledge of the Truth; they are led into a *Labyrinth*, whence they cannot extricate themselves. and reduced to that uncertainty, that they do not know into what Religion they are baptized; for their Preachers require them to Educate their Children in the *Covenants* of the *Kirk of Scotland*, *Westminster Confession* and *Catechisms*; and is it likely, that when they are bid shift for themselves in such a Desert, (without the conduct of the *Grave, Ancient, Comprehensive, and solid Forms* of the *Christian Church*) they can arrive at any measure of *true Christian Knowledge*.

Another remarkable *Innovation* in their Government is this, That tho' they have banished *Bishops* and *Deacons*, contrary to the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, yet, (to make amends) they have introduced another Order of Men into the *Ecclesiastical* Government that is altogether *New*, and of their own Invention. I mean their *Lay-elders*; and these are said by them, to be vested with the same *Spiritual Jurisdiction* and *Power* of Government (in all things belonging to the Discipline and Polity of the Church) as other *Presbyters* are; Nay more, they Judge, Examine, and Censure the *Clergy*, as much as any of the *Clergy themselves* may do. There could not be

a bolder *Encroachment* upon the *Spiritual Authority* of *Ecclesiastics*, than by such a *Sacrilegious Usurpation*. What right have they to the *Name* or *Office* of *Presbyters*, who are not duly distinguished by an *Authoritative Mission* from the rest of *Mankind*, to serve in the *Offices* of *Religion*, who have no *imposition of Hands* from the *Governors* of the *Church*, no, nor from *their own Consistories*. And if they have such a *Power* in the *Ecclesiastical Government* as is pretended; how notorious is the *Encroachment* of *Presbyterian Preachers*, over those *Lay-Elders*, (who are said to have equal *Power* with themselves,) in that they never suffer *them*, whose sole *Office* is *Government*, (and therefore may be presumed to be better acquainted with it, than they who are diverted with *Cares* of another *Nature*) to interpolate in the most *Essential Acts* of *Jurisdiction*, I mean the *solemn* and *Authoritative Imposition of Hands*; *Administration* of *Sacraments*, and *Absolution* of *Penitents*; and how *inexcusable* must those silly *Creatures* be, who never plead their own *Right* in an *Affair* of this *Consequence* ! But the *Truth* is, thò *their Leaders* have possessed them with the thought of *their* having an *equal share* in the *Ecclesiastical Government* and *Jurisdiction*, yet they never durst venture upon the most *Essential Acts* of *Power* and

Authority; they are a *Set* of Men thrust into the *Room* of *Clergy-men*, without any shew of a *Title*, either in the word of *God*, nor in the *Practice* of the *Ancient Church*.

Another *Theorem*, by which they endeavour to recommend themselves and their *Party* to the *unthinking multitude*, is this, They affirm, that there is an unalterable *Right* in the *body* of the *People*, to chuse their own *Pastors*; thô they take great care to *Order* the matter so, as none be admitted into *Ecclesiastical Offices* but such as the *Consistory* approves. They who were designed for *Holy Orders* in the *Primitive Church*, were first *Publicly* named in their *Assemblies*, that the *People* might know whether any *Crime* could be objected against their *Promotion*; and if upon due *Tryal*, they were found *Innocent*, then the *Church* proceeded to a *Regular Ordination*; but when the *Multitude* began to think that the *Original Power* of naming *Clergy-men*, was lodg'd in themselves, then *Tumults* and *Confusions* became innumerable: And there are some *Ancient Canons* that suppose the *People* to be unwilling to receive the *Bishop*, after he is *Ordained*, as the 36 *Canon* of the *Apostles*. Such a *Constitution* had been altogether ridiculous, if the *People* in those *Days* were at *Liberty* to chuse whom they

they pleased. It were impossible to establish *Uniformity* in any part of the Christian Church, if *popular Elections*, without *their necessary Restrictions and Limitations*, were allowed; the *Multitude* in most places, (if left to *their own Discretion*,) would chuse such as resemble themselves in their *Morals* and *Intellectuals*. The Practices of contending *Parties* upon those occasions are Scandalous and Abominable: *Impudence* and *Faction* appear every where without disguise. Can there be any thing more Reproachful, than to see a Company of mean *Mechanicks* laying Wagers, that such a one shall Preach better than another? It was not their *Talent of Preaching*, that recommended them in the *Primitive Church*, when the *Christians* were of one Heart and of one Mind; both *Clergy* and *Laity* agreed to advance those who were most eminent for *Charity*, *Piety*, *Chastity*, and a Holy Life. I need not dwell upon this *New Opinion*; the present *Presbyterian* Practice condemns it to all intents and purposes, since they allow no Congregation to chuse for themselves.

Another remarkable *Theorem*, upon which the *Vindicator* values himself is, his odd and extraordinary Interpretation of the Words of *S. Jerom*, in his *Epistle*

to *Evagrius*. It must be confess'd, that if there be any Honour due to the Author of that Paradoxical Exposition of the Words of *S. Jerome*, 'tis only owing to his own Invention; if *Ordinatio* in the Language of *S. Jerome*, signifieth the ordering of Meetings, and not the *Episcopal Imposition* of Hands, then it must be acknowledged, that the *Vindicator* alone hath made this Discovery. However, tho' his Notion is a little out of the common road, yet he thinks it very consistent with more learning, than ever the *Apologist* is master of. The Question is not, what Degrees of Learning his Adversary hath attain'd, but whether his Exposition of *S. Jerome*, can be reconcil'd to common Sense, the Language of that Age in which *S. Jerome* wrote, or any other Writer of the Christian Church.

He tells us, that *some Learned Men have* P. 20. had odd Apprehensions of somethings. And why shou'd he be blamed more than *Grotius*, who was the wonder of his Age for Critical skill? For, he had some speculations that were as much Paradoxical and unusual, as the *Vindicator's* Exposition of the words of *S. Jerome*. As for Instance, *Grotius* will have *Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι*, 1 Cor 12. 28. to be *Diocesan Bishops*; this, saith he, is contrary, or at least, without Countenance,

from all *Lexicographers, Criticks, and other Expositors*; thus, he is sufficiently justified, (he thinks) by a Parallel Example, in the Writings of *Grotius*.

Whether the *Vindicator* does modestly compare his own Interpretation of *S. Jerom's* Epistle, with that Exposition of *1 Cor. 12. 28.* offered by *Grotius*, I leave it to others to Determine. Let us now enquire, whether *Grotius* his Exposition be without any Countenance from *Lexicographers, Criticks, and other Expositors*; the word signifies properly, to help one that is ready to fall. This was the Duty and Practice of those, who were stronger in the Faith, and higher in Authority; of whom then could this be so easily meant, as of those who were *Præsides Presbyterii*? It is certain that *Grotius* saw the Episcopal Authority, in several Texts of Scripture, that the *Vindicator* will not allow to be *decisive* Proofs in our favours, We ought not to think that when the Apostles and their Disciples mentioned the Jurisdiction and Authority of a Bishop, they should always make use of the very same words that are now current in our Days; there are so many Allusions to the Practice of the Temple and Synagogue, in the Writings of the New Testament, that, if we
would

would understand the last, we must necessarily be somewhat acquainted with the *first*. Let the *Vindicator* be advised to read *Grotius* his Annotations on the 12 *Chap.* of the Epistle to the *Romans*, and perhaps he may see some Texts interpreted of *Episcopal* Jurisdiction, without either Force or Violence, which he was not formerly aware of; as also his Commentaries on 1 *Cor.* 12. 5.

The Context also 1 *Cor.* 12. leads naturally to this Interpretation, since in that and in the preceding Verses, the Apostle distinguishes the several *Offices, Jurisdictions, Gifts, and Authorities*, that were then most observable in the Apostolick Church; I suppose, that the helping of such as were ready to fall, did most properly belong to the Spiritual Governours, and our *Vindicator* shou'd not say, that *Grotius* had no *Precedent* to direct him in this Exposition. For, in that very place that he cites from *Grotius*, he might see that the Ancient Greeks did interpret the Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, mentioned by the Apostle, by Πρεσβυτέρια, or *Presbiteria Ecclesiastica*. But if he had rather see this with his own Eyes in some *Lexicographer*, than in the Writings of *Grotius*, let him consult the * *Book* cited in the Margin.

* *Thesaur. Græc.*
Casp. Suteri. *Thesaur. Eccles. e Pat. Græc. Ordine Alph. continetur.*
Amstelæd. Apud *Wassenaum*, 1682.

Does he think, that *Grotius* knew not the current Significations of words, in the most Ancient *Greek* Authors? Or does he know any Man of that Age, in which *Grotius* liv'd, better qualified to write a *Lexicon*, than *Grotius* himself? Nor did *Grotius* positively affirm, that the word *Ἀντιλήψεις*, in that place, did signifie the *Præsides Presbyterii*; his words are, *Ea vox cum satis generalis sit, hoc loco videtur significare Præsides Presbyterii, qui populum commonefacere Officii sui solebant.* And he refers his Reader to his Expositions on *Luke* 1. 54. which if the *Vindicator* had considered, he had not been so rash as to affirm that *Grotius* had no Countenance from any *Lexicographer*, *Critick*, or *Expositor*. And *Joan. Caspar. Suicer.* to whom I have referr'd him already, informs us, that the Ancient *Glossary* in the *Medicean Library*, interprets the *Ἀντιλήψεις*, by the *Προσβολαὶ καὶ ποιούμενων.* 'Tis true, that the word is general, but *Grotius* took his measures from the Circumstances of the Context, and determin'd his Exposition to those *Spiritual* helps of Government, which the Text wou'd allow of; and that can be no other, than the help which is afforded to the weakest by the stronger: The help that is given to Children by their Parents, to Pupils by their Tutors, to Peo-
ple.

ple by their Governors: For to help one that is ready to fall, naturally implies, the Care, Strength, and Compassion of him that helps, as well as the Weakness, Danger, and Necessity, of him that is helped.

That the word Ἀνπλαμύσσου signifies frequently the care of Governours may be made evident from many places, particularly from *Psal.* 48. as the Vatican Copy of LXX. reads it, Ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ταῖς βαρεῖαι ἀυτῆς γινώσκειται, ὅταν ἀνπλαμύσσειται αὐτῆς, which last words must signifie, *Cum suscipiet eam* (viz.) *Civitatem in Tutelam*. Accordingly, *Emilius Portus* translates the word Ἀνπλαμύσσει, from *Suidas*, *Propugnator, Defensor, Auxiliator*.

Now I think, it is not easy for the *Vindicator* to give us a better Exposition of Ἀνπλαμύσσει, than that which is offered by *Grotius*, especially considering the Circumstances of the Text, the Authority of *Grotius*, the Probability of his Exposition, the modesty of his Expression, and his great diligence in comparing one place with another. Let me humbly intreat the *Vindicator*, that however he is pleased to dispose of the Apologist, he wou'd forbear to make any Comparisons with *Grotius*; when he reads the Books that I have refer'd him to, he must needs acknowledge,

ledge that *Grotius* had better *Authorities* than he is aware of, and that he read many *Lexicographers*, whose very Names are unknown to the *Vindicator*. Yet I dare not deny, but that there are several instances of such unequal Comparisons, in some Ancient and Authentick Authors.

Virg. Eccl. 10.

*Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Melibæe, putavi
Stultus ego, huic nostræ similem.*

But the *Vindicator* seldom wants an Argument to prove his own Opinions, and therefore he tells us, that if *S. Jerom* be not interpreted in his way, (*i. e.* if *Ordinatio* does not signifie the Ordering of Meetings). then he contradicts himself, and overthrows what he endeavoured to establish all along, his Epistle to *Evagrius*.

The meaning of this is no more, than that whenever *S. Jerom* seems to favour the Power of Bishops over Presbyters, some new *Fantastick* Significations must be invented for his words; and since it must be so, and that the *Vindicator* is so good at inventing new Expositions, I would humbly intreat him, to give us his *Paraphrase* and *Commentary* upon the conclusion of that very Epistle to *Evagrius*; in which *S. Jerom* affirms, that the

the *Hierarchy* of *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon*, was founded upon *Apostolical Tradition*, and that they hold the same place in the *Christian Church*, which the *High-Priest, Priests, and Levites* held in the *Temple*. Al. Evagr.

There are an hundred things in the Book, now under Consideration, that I have no mind to meddle with: They are either trifling Stories, or Personal Reflexions.

As for the *first*, I am not at leisure to examine them. It is not a Pin matter to me how the *Vindicator* disguises or relates the *Presbyterian Rabblings*. They are still unexcusable in their Nature; let him Palliate or Extenuate such Practices as he sees convenient; I am not inclined to follow him through the *Labyrinth* of Impertinencies that are put together upon that Subject.

He blames the *Apologist*, that he gave but an account of *one Tumult*; but the other (which *Lieutenant General Dalryel* endeavoured to Suppress) he omitted.

But how comes the *Author* of the *Apology* to be blamed, for not narrating a Story which had no relation to the *Tumults* that were set on Foot by the *Presbyterians* in the beginning of the *late Revolution*. He designed no History of the *Collage of Edinburgh*, nor was he con-

cerned to know what passed in that *Society* several Years before he was acquainted with *it*. When I read this part of his Defence, I wondered what kind of Men we had to do with, since he would oblige his *Adversary* to fill his Pages with a thousand Idle Stories that *he* never had opportunity to know.

Next, he says, that *he does not find that the Students had the College-Mace carried before them, when General Dalysel endeavoured to suppress that Tumult*. But whoever said that at that time, they had the College-Mace carried before them? For my part I neither know, nor did I ever enquire what was carried before them or behind them.

Then again he tells us, *that it is not true that the Masters did permit such a thing*. I incline to think that he is in the right. I believe the *Masters* did neither permit nor approve it. But what is this to our business, when other *Masters* were forced by their uneasy Circumstances, and against *their own inclinations* to permit it. The *Scholars had not the College-Mace carried before them, when Lieutenant General Dalysel endeavoured to dissipate them in the Grass-Mercat: Ergo, they had it not in the Year 1689*. as is related by the Author
of

of the Apology. Who would be condemn'd to consider such Impertinencies?

But he will prove this piece of History. For the *Principal* (says he) *who (may be) is not unknown to this Author, did most furiously rebuke and threaten one of the chief Actors in that Scene, i.e. when General Dalziel was employed to restrain them.*

I cannot for my Life guess his meaning in these words. It is certain, that the *Author* of the *Apology* was acquainted with him that was *then Principal*, but he is altogether a Stranger to any thing that the *Principal* did in that Period to suppress the *Tumults*; nor was he ever concerned to enquire into it more than others of the *Clergy*, who *then* lived in the Country as he did.

But he reproved one of the Chief Actors furiously.

The more I read in this Paragraph, the more *Darkness* and *Confusion* round about me. Had the Person that *he* hints at any *Authority* at that time to reprove the least disorder in that *Society*: for I suppose the Scandalous Villain, (that *he* means) was not come to the *College* of *Edinburgh* for several Years after *Lieutenant General Dalziel* was dead? I take him to be no other than *Robert Brown*, the
Plundering

Plundering Reformer, who afterwards made himself as famous in *Flanders* for *Robberies*, as he was at *Edinburgh* for *Tumults*; He perhaps was taken Notice of in the beginning of the *Late Revolution*. Here in Seven or Eight Lines, I find the *Vindicator* in as many mistakes as there are words; and this is enough to let him and others see, that, whatever his other Accomplishments are, there is not a Man upon Earth less qualified to be an Historian. What had the *Author* of the *Apology* to do with those Occurrences that fell out in that *Society*, several Years before he knew it? Such things as had no relation to his Design, nor to the Tumults at the beginning of the *Last Revolution*. Were it not easier to row in the Gallies than to consider such trifling Cavils?

Def. Vind. p. 8.

Next, as to his Personal Reflexions, I think it not worth my while to rake into that Puddle. He tells us, that the *Apologist* said, that *he read the Vindicator's whole Book with Passion*. He himself knows very well that this is most fraudulently misrepresented. All that *he said* was no more than that he was *provoked in every other Line to the Undecencies of Passion*. And is it necessary to fall into those Disorders at all times, when

Apol. p. 1.

when we are provoked? God forbid.

Again we are told, that the *Author* of the *Apology* says, that he had not the *Vindicator's* Book by him when he endeavour'd to refute it. But this he neither said nor thought. He might say that his *Library then*, (and in the Circumstances he was in) was not worth the naming.

In another place he is very angry that the *Author* of the *Apology* should have said, that the Presbyterians had no Authority over the Episcopal Clergy, but what they derived from the *State*; and upon this occasion he represents his Adversary as if he was pleading for *Era-astianism*. But it is very extravagant in him to think that Forty or Fifty Preachers of the *Presbyterian* way, had any *Ecclesiastical Authority* over a Thousand of the *Episcopal Clergy*. Who gave them any Power to meddle with our Clergy, but the *Convention*? Or rather a *Party* in the *Convention*. If *Parity* of Presbyters be the Rule of Ecclesiastical Government, who put the *Episcopal Clergy* under their Jurisdiction? Do they pretend Scripture for this *Late* and *Monstrous* Edition of *Presbytery*, by which Fifty or Threescore *Remonstrators* are advanced to domineer over a Thousand? This is

a Flight of *Erastianism*, never before heard in the *Christian Church*.

I am wearied of mentioning his Reflections. I wish he would forbear such Practices, and see what he can do to support his cause by a fair Tryal, without the assistance of *Personal Libels* and *Whiffling Stories*: and unless *he* and his *Associates* manage *their* Controversies with greater Candour and Civility, I think not my self obliged to consider any of *their* Books, far less to answer *such*, whose Names and Character I am not acquainted with. If our *Adversaries* have nothing in their view than to make the People acquainted with the *Truth*, *they* need not the help of those mean and *Nasty* Methods that hitherto they have made use of. Such Arguments are proper for the *Rabble*, and for them too, only in *their* mad Intervals of *Fury* and *Reformation*. They who have engaged the *Unthinking* Multitude in this violent Opposition against the *Christian Church*, are concerned to let the more *Intelligent* part of the *Nation* see, that *their* *New Scheme* is founded, either upon *Reason*, *Revelation*, or the *Practice* of the *Purest* Antiquity. I should be very sorry if any of them understood this humble *Entreaty* to proceed from *Vanity*, *Pride*, or *Insolence*.

lence. I abhor all hot-headed Defiances. I ought to know my self better than to provoke any Man alive : but I desire to be Instructed ; and I am as yet fully persuaded that the whole Fabric of *their* Government and Discipline is altogether *New*, and consequently highly *Dangerous* and *Antichristian* : and I wish my Country-men would inform *themselves* of the *true* state of our Debates, that they may not be imposed upon in an affair of this Consequence, nor think that *God Almighty* can be served by *Brutal* and *Superstitious* Passions, by a *blind* Rage and *Impetuous* Zeal, but by a *reasonable* Service, such as becomes the Dignity of our *Nature*, the *Majesty* and *Gravity* of Publick *Worship*, and the *Infinite* Wisdom of that *Supreme Being*, to whom we owe all *Worship* and *Obedience*.

It may be that the *Vindicator* thinks, that he has been formerly treated with some Severity ; but *he* knows that *he* only owes it to himself. I am not in love with *Contention*, nor with *Contentious* Men. I have no inclination to continue this Debate, otherwise than it may serve the *Christian Church*, and the *true* ends of *Edification*. We are Baptized into the Discipline and Profession of *Humility* and *Charity* : *Self-denial*, and *Meekness*,
are

An Enquiry into

are amongst the *First* and *Original* lessons of the Christian Institution. Let us therefore sincerely examine the *Springs* and *Motives* of *all* our Actions, and of our Publick Debates in a Particular manner. *Revenge* and *Hypocrisie* are frequently at the bottom of the most *Plausible Performances*. The *Surly* humour of many *Nominal* Christians is very inconsistent with the Religion they Profess. Some Men set up for *Reformers* of *others*, who are *themselves* Slaves to the Vilest Passions. Some would overawe the World into the *Belief* of *their New* Opinions, when *their Rage* and *Irregular Heats* openly defie all *Justice* and *Religion*.

S I R,

I am afraid I have put your Patience too much to the Trial; and yet this discourse seems to be but a short *Essay*, in comparison of what might be written on these Heads. If *they* oblige me to continue the Examination of the *New* Opinions, by *Fair* and *Christian* Methods, or by such Arguments as have any *Real* or *Apparent* weight, then I may be encouraged to enter into a more Narrow Disquisition. Indeed when we view our present Circumstances and many-fold Infirmities

firmities, we must needs acknowledge that of *our selves* we have no strength to stop the *Current* of *Popular* and *Prevailing* Errors. We ought to know our own *Frailties* and *Weaknesses* better, than to imagine that we can resist, or stand before an *Impetuous* Tide, when it is arising. We must not expect that the *Giddy* Multitude will turn *Philosophers*, or that we *Our selves* are the fittest Instruments to *Reform* a *Nation*, so much sunk under the Power of *Prejudice* and *Delusion*.

On the other hand, we must remember, that our *blessed* *Saviour* redeemed the *Church* with his own Blood; that the *Faith* once delivered unto the *Saints*, is best preserved within the *Enclosures* of *Order* and *Unity*; that this *Unity* cannot be maintained, if we openly condemn the *Practice*, *Forms*, and *Rituals* of the *Universal Church*; that *Schism* ordinarily ends in *Herésie* and *Delusions*; and therefore neither *Oppressions* nor *Disasters* can excuse us from doing our best to preserve the People from *Error* and *Entbusiasm*. *True Faith* is the *Spring* of a *Holy Life*; and if we practice the *One*, we must profess the *Other*, as it was deliver'd to us by the *Suffrages* of all former *Generations*. And though we cannot get into a *Pulpit* every day, as when
we

we enjoyed the Protection of the *Laws*; yet we must do what we can to give the People a Just account of the *Dangers* they are exposed to. God planted the *Church* by the Ministry of weak Instruments, and confounded the *Wisdom of the World* by the *Foolishness of Preaching*; and it is not easie to guess what he may do still, by the Interposal of the meanest Creatures. Let us lay to Heart the *Desolate Condition* of the *Church*, how much the *Ancient Faith* and Severity of *Morals* is trodden upon in the *Streets*. Can we hear the *Unaccountable Follies of Enthusiasts*, or the *Blasphemies of Atheism*, without *Fear* and *Trembling*! Let us pray unto *him* who is a *Present help in time of trouble*; especially in these days of *Darkness* and *Profanity*, when *Atheism* seems to ride in *Triumph*, when *Irreligion* bids open *Defiance* to *Heaven*, as if every little *Fool* could pull the *Almighty* from *his Throne*, and overturn the *Fundamental Notions* of *Nature*, *Justice*, *Religion*, and *Society*. If the *Foundations* be destroyed what can the *Righteous* do? One thing still remains as our last and surest *Refuge*, to besiege the *Heavens* by our *fervent Prayers*, that he would be pleased to pity the *Vine* that he hath planted with *his own Right hand*, that the *Catholic Church*

Church may be so guid'd and Govern'd by his good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of Truth, and hold the Faith in Unity of Spirit, in the Bond of Peace, and in Righteousness of Life. Let us firmly believe the watchful Providence of God and his Love to the Church, even when it is Chastised and Oppressed. The less we Lean on Earthly helps, so much the more earnestly we ply the Throne of Heaven. I looked, (saith the Psalmist) on my right Hand, and beheld, but there was no Man that would know: Refuge fail'd me, no Man cared for my Soul; I cryed unto thee, O Lord, I said thou art my Refuge and my Portion in the Land of the Living. Attend unto my Cry, for I am brought very low. The Prayers of the Just, that are animated by Faith and Love, are Irresistible. When S. Peter was sinking, his Soul moved so strongly towards God, that it was not possible for the Devil to hinder him. We may be diverted in our Prayers by several Temptations, when we are Remiss and out of Order; but when the Soul is recollected, and leans on God alone, we plead by those Arguments that are strong and everlasting, and never fails them who put their trust under the shadow

of his Wings. If our private Calamities occasion our *Humiliations* and *Repentance*, ought we not to pray for the *Peace* of Jerusalem, *For my Brethren and Companions sakes*, I will now say *Peace be within thee. Let us lift our Eyes to him that dwells in the Heavens*, for our Soul is exceedingly filled with the *scorning* of those that are at ease, and with the *Contempt* of the Proud.

But we, (who have been separated for the solemn *Services* of Religion) ought in a more special manner to be thus employed and to exhort the People, in *Season and out of Season*, to keep within the *Unity* of the *Christian Church*. Every *New Doctrine* in Religion ought to be examined. If we are shaken with every Wind, it is an Argument that we are not sufficiently established in the *Truth*. We must not venture our Souls amongst a *Society* of Men, who are lately come upon the *Stage*, all whose *Appearances* have been fatal to *Truth*, *Peace*, and *Order*. We are *unacquainted* with their *Mission* and *Ordination*. Let us examine their *Pretences* by the most *Ancient* and *Genuine Records*, and stand in the good *Old Ways*, for in *these* only we shall find rest unto our *Souls*. *Truth* loves to inhabit *Calm* and *Serene* Spirits: It cannot enter where all the *Avenues* are blocked up with *Bitterness*

ness and Indignation. The Zeal of God's House is Active, but full of Light; and when we are warmed by its Rayes, it teaches us to Mortifie the Flesh with the Affections and Lusts thereof, to be Patient in Tribulation, rejoicing in Hope. Our Time runs fast, we are shortly to appear before our Omniscient Judge, and He knows the first Motions and the darkeſt Reſeſſes of our Souls. The Night and the Light are both alike unto him. We muſt ſhortly give an Account of what we have done, or ſhall do in the body; let us therefore paſs the time of our ſojourning here in fear, and pray for Aſſiſtance and Illumination from above, to lead us through the Windings and Turnings of this Dark and Tempeſtuons World, that when we leave theſe vain and empty Shadows, we may (with Joy and Confidence) give up our Souls unto God. as unto the Hands of our MOST FAITHFUL CREATOR.

Give my Dutiful Reſpects to all our Friends, I bid you heartily farewell, and I continue,

S I R,

Your moſt Affectionate

Humble Servant.

B O O K S lately Printed for
Walter Kettilby.

A Discourse concerning Lent, in two Parts; the First, An Historical Account of its Observation; the Second, An Essay concerning its Original. This subdivided into two Repartitions, whereof the First is preparatory, and shews, that most of our Christian Ordinances are derived from the Jews, and the Second Conjectures, that Lent is of the same Original. By *George Hooper, D. D.* Dean of *Canterbury*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.

True Conduct of Persons of Quality.
Translated out of French, *Octavo.*

A Treatise relating to the Worship of God, divided into Six Sections, Concerning first, The Nature of Divine Worship; secondly, the peculiar Object of Worship; thirdly, the true Worshippers of God; fourthly, Assistance requisite to Worship; fifthly, the place of Worship; sixthly, the solemn Time of Worship. By *John Templer, D. D.* *Octavo.*

A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Reverend Dr. John Scot, by Z. Isham, Rector of St. Botolph's Bishop-gate, Quar.

Two Assize Sermons, Preached at the Assizes at Winchester, Quarto.









